

Raymond A. Bucher, Schaefferstown.
James L. Woodward, Shinglehouse.
Evelyn A. Boehringer, Silverdale.
Francis B. Reed, Summerytown.
Earle V. Miller, Union City.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Charles S. Adams, Burke.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast dispelled the darkness of the night and illumined the earth with the radiant splendor of a new day, we rejoice that Thou art always bestowing upon us the blessings of Thy bountiful providence and unfailing love.

We pray that we may now open widely the doors of our minds and hearts to the promptings and persuasions of Thy Holy Spirit and receive a vivid and vital experience of Thy guiding and sustaining presence as we address ourselves to tasks which are far beyond our own finite wisdom and strength.

Daily our thoughts go out to the men on the far-away battlefields who are serving our country with great fidelity and fortitude. Grant that we may never be guilty of a careless and complacent temper of soul as we think of the tremendous struggles and sacrifices which they are making to safeguard the heritage of freedom which we are privileged to enjoy.

May we be loyal partners with all who are seeking to open the way toward a happier and more abundant life for all mankind. Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who went about doing good and was moved with compassion for needy and suffering humanity. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on September 20, 1950, the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On September 20, 1950:

H. R. 3314. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Eulogio Reyes Suarez;

H. R. 4891. An act for the relief of Albert E. Scheflen;

H. R. 5941. An act to incorporate The Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America;

H. R. 5972. An act for the relief of Ivar G. Johnson;

H. R. 6986. An act relating to the acquisition and addition of certain lands to Fort Frederica National Monument, in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7990. An act to incorporate the American Society of International Law, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8337. An act for the relief of William A. Hogan;

H. R. 8362. An act for the relief of Bernard Croft;

H. R. 8563. An act for the relief of Alonzo P. Brown; and

H. J. Res. 536. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Harvey N. Davis and Arthur H. Compton as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9399. An act to provide a more effective method of delivering applications for absentee ballots to servicemen and certain other persons; and

H. R. 9455. An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, as amended, so as to facilitate voting by members of the Armed Forces, and certain others, absent from their places of residence.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2801. An act to give effect to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5244) entitled "An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles J. Trees, Army of the United States," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. JENNER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1056. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased;

H. R. 7824. An act to provide for the administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9490. An act to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 9490. An act to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes.

WAIVER OF NAVIGATION AND VESSEL-INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9681) to authorize the waiver of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the head of each department or agency responsible for the administration of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws is directed to waive compliance with such laws upon the request of the Secretary of Defense to the extent deemed necessary in the interest of national defense by the Secretary of Defense. The head of such department or agency is authorized to waive compliance with such laws to such extent and in such manner and upon such terms as he may prescribe, either upon his own initiative or upon the written recommendation of the head of any other Government agency, whenever he deems that such action is necessary in the interest of national defense.

SEC. 2. The authority granted by this act shall continue until such time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

SEC. 3. The joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard," approved March 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 33), as amended, is repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "continue until" and insert "terminate at."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SUBSECTION (1) OF SECTION 4551 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, AS AMENDED

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9538) to amend subsection (1) of section 4551 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to exempt additional vessels from the requirements thereof.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, this bill amends the Revised Statutes, which now requires that certain frequent reports be made by owners of vessels. The bill exempts the owners of seagoing barges, tugs, towboats, and certain ferries, if not engaged in international commerce, from compiling those reports. They have been found to be of no public benefit and administratively burdensome.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the Department itself does not care to receive these reports?

Mr. HART. The Department has recommended the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (1) of section 4551 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 643 (1)), is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting the following sentence in lieu thereof: "This subsection shall not apply to (1) seagoing barges; (2) tugs; (3) towboats; (4) any ferry, if such ferry is employed exclusively in trade on the Great Lakes, lakes (other than the Great Lakes), bays, sounds, bayous, canals, and harbors, and is not engaged on an international voyage; and (5) other vessels employed exclusively in trade on lakes (other than the Great Lakes), bays, sounds, bayous, canals, and harbors."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the figure "(1)" and insert the letter "(1)."

Page 1, line 4, strike out the figure "(1)" and insert the letter "(1)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend subsection (1) of section 4551 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to exempt additional vessels from the requirements thereof."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9322) to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment and maintenance of aids to navigation on private structures in or over navigable waters of the United States.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, this bill gives authority to the Coast Guard to prescribe light signals for bridges. Under the General Bridge Act of 1946 this authority was omitted from the act, and the bill brings the act into conformity with the Coast Guard's historical jurisdiction over the markings of bridges.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 85 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 85. Aids to maritime navigation on private structures; penalty

"Any person owning or operating any bridge, pier, wharf, dolphin, boom, wier, breakwater, bulkhead, jetty, dike, dam, causeway, or similar structure in or over any navigable water of the United States shall establish, maintain, and operate at his own expense such lights and signals for the protection of maritime navigation as the Secretary shall prescribe. Refusal or failure to establish, maintain, or operate such signals or lights, or to obey any of the lawful rules or regulations relating thereto, shall be deemed

a misdemeanor, and shall subject such person to a fine not exceeding the sum of \$100 for each offense. Each day during which a violation continues shall be considered as a new offense."

SEC. 2. Section 18 of the Federal Water Power Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 16, sec. 811), is amended by striking out the words "Secretary of War" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "person", insert the following: "or public body, or instrumentality, excluding an agency of the United States."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "occupying."

Page 2, line 5, after the words "shall prescribe", insert a new sentence as follows: "The Secretary shall prescribe reasonable rules and regulations relative to the maintenance of lights and signals for the protection of maritime navigation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. In view of the legislative conditions, the Chair would prefer not to recognize Members to address the House for 1 minute, but will recognize Members to extend their remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. KELLY of New York and Mr. PRICE asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. WHITE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in one include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in one include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include editorials and other extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$225.50.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news report from the Lawrence Journal World, reporting a speech by the chancellor of the University of Kansas.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SEARCH FOR PEACE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, now that we are making better progress in war, let us not assume that we can put all our eggs in one basket. The search for peace through the United Nations should continue unabated.

Among those who want to be our allies in the search for peace, at least one has much influence in Asia, where our prestige diplomatically is lowest. I speak of India, whose efforts for peaceable settlement of Asiatic problems should be encouraged, not rebuffed.

It is not necessary that we accept proposals which appease the Reds in order to induce India to use her great influence in ways favorable to American world objectives. Asia knows that during World War II and during the postwar years she occupied a secondary place in American thinking. She is not convinced that our plans for Asia today are other than those of imperialistic exploitation. India can help greatly to convince Asia that we really do want a better understanding of the mind and heart of Asia.

GET EVIDENCE AGAINST NORTH KOREAN WAR CRIMINALS—NOW

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, what do our men in the front lines think of the battle of words in the UN?

We had better find out directly from those who are really fighting back against the aggressors.

I believe that the time has come to cut out the shadow-boxing in the United Nations and get down to business.

The indiscriminate use of the veto must be curtailed, an effective UN police force must be organized, and the North Korean war criminals must be indicted without further delay.

The precedent for such action was established following World War II, but the proceedings dragged on without end. Many criminals escaped because valuable evidence was lost through delay.

The people of the United States have been outraged by the unprovoked aggression against South Korea and by the mounting evidence of atrocities committed against our troops. They have been amazed by the feeble protests, unsupported by any definite action on the part of the UN, to assemble the case against the North Korean Communists, at once.

No wonder our fighting men ask if the diplomats really understand what they

are up against when the reaction in the UN is limited to speeches that are spiced up at times by a daring bit of name-calling. The word-and-gesture duel at the UN has become a feature television show that entertains some on the home front, but fails to satisfy any of the men on the fighting fronts. The GI's would like to see the UN track down those who are responsible for the crimes against their buddies including the accessories before the fact.

I ask, therefore, that our representatives to the UN be instructed to press for action on this issue.

Reporters, photographers, GI's who saw what was done by the enemy to their helpless buddies—all should be called to appear as witnesses before the UN so that no evidence will be lost when the war criminals are finally brought to trial. By this we shall prove to our fighting men and to the world that the United Nations is determined to punish these evildoers for their crimes against humanity.

THE THIRTY-EIGHTH PARALLEL

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the Hiss Survivors Association down at the State Department, who wear upon their breasts the Cross of Yalta, are waiting for Congress to go home before they lift the curtain on the next act in the tragedy of Red appeasement. Dean Acheson's symphony are composing a new movement in their "Let's Not Be Nasty to the Commies" oratorio. In order to appease their erstwhile friend "Good Old Joe," to whom they have ceded half of Europe and most of Asia, they now plan to subvert our military victory by calling a halt at the thirty-eighth parallel. The scheme is to cringe behind this imaginary line leaving to the UN—and to Russia's veto—the possibility of muddling through a solution to the problem of a united Korea.

Any attempt to call off our forces or to remove them from Korea before the entire nation has been unified and a free Republic assured simply means that we will have to do the job over again at perhaps greater cost in blood and toil and sweat and tears.

While in Taegu, Korea, during the actual shelling of that city I talked to two members of the UN commission and asked them what they thought about stopping at the thirty-eighth parallel. Both of them asserted in strong terms that it would be the utmost folly to hope further to appease the Reds by any such irresolute action. Of course, I do not know what they will do if our Government applies pressure upon them through their governments.

I do know that long before the victory is won the Acheson crowd are pursuing a policy which will give it away. Giveaway programs at home merely weaken the economy and increase the cost of living. A giveaway program in

Korea is treasonable and you had better be prepared to warn your constituents what the State Department is up to.

PREPARATION OF UNIFORM CATALOG

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Tuesday last, to visit our naval supply depot at Mechanicsburg, Pa., in company with Congressman DAWSON, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and Congressman BONNER, chairman of the subcommittee. Our purpose was to consider the progress of the joint effort of the War Munitions Board and General Services Administration in preparing the uniform catalog. The plan has the approval of the Congress and is being followed by our committee of the House. I think it will be of interest to the Members to know something about this endeavor and its progress.

As a member of the Rizley subcommittee of the Eightieth Congress, I helped investigate the complaints coming to the Congress concerning the ineffectiveness and inefficiency of the War Assets Administration. We found that the great losses entailed in this disposal program were due mostly to the fact that the armed services which provided the surplus had no uniform system of cataloging their purchases and the War Assets Administration was forced to sell, in many instances, their stock on a pig-in-a-poke basis. President Roosevelt had recommended as early as 1943 that this uniform catalog be established but it was not until 1947 that a start was finally made. By this time most of World War II surplus had been disposed. It was determined however that this same mistake should not be repeated.

The War Munitions Board, because it had the money, embarked upon the task by Executive order and with the pledged cooperation of the various components of the armed services. The committee of which I happen to be a member, sponsored Public Law 152, which brought under one administration the purchasing, disposal, and housekeeping duties of the Federal Government, and called this new agency the General Services Administration. We realized that the Federal Government was the largest single purchaser in the country even in peacetime. It was also recognized that should we have another war that General Services Administration would be the disposal agency for the generated surplus. This emphasized the need for a coordinated and integrated policy between the armed services and General Services as to cataloging or a uniform system.

You see, without a uniform policy of cataloging purchases, their disposition by the Government either by sale to private business or gift to our educational and health institutions would be ineffective. Due to a common agreement between the Congress, the armed services,

and General Services Administration the cataloging effort initiated by the War Munitions Board became a joint effort to develop a uniform catalog.

It was contemplated last spring that this catalog would be completed by 1952. When another war appeared imminent Secretary Johnson urged that greater effort be made to complete this task within another year.

Our visit to the Mechanicsburg installation was to view the center of this cataloging project. We were impressed with the progress that was being made but even more with the possible savings that will accrue. One example was cited in which a single cotter pin had 1,108 different listings and consequent numbers. The elimination of duplicate or near-duplicate listings will enormously decrease the storage and inventory problems, to say nothing of sale in case any material is declared surplus. Another example cited was that savings of millions of dollars could be effected by buying an item from the lowest-cost producer. For example, a bushing—variously labeled—was listed at prices ranging from \$32 to \$57, although the item was identical in every instance.

Great savings will also accrue by having a coordinated purchasing policy, thus avoiding unwarranted competition between various components of the armed services for similar items. Most of you can doubtless recall instances during World War II when the Army and Navy were bidding against each other for items thus needlessly increasing the ultimate cost. Or due to the fact that they had no uniform catalog, one branch of the service might have a deficit of an item that the other service had in surplus but there was no way in which the surplus could meet the deficiency. It would be like trying to order an item from Sears with a Montgomery-Ward catalog number.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is not going to be an easy one to solve, but progress is being made and with intense application may be completed by 1951 instead of 1952 as originally contemplated. To do so will save millions in view of our stepped-up purchasing program. We came back from Mechanicsburg with the impression that this very important project should have the complete support of the Congress and careful observation by our Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRESTON L. WATSON

Mr. BYRNE of New York submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1056) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased:

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 3122)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1056) for the relief of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, having met, after full and

free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "claim", insert "with such interest as the court may determine."

On page 2, line 10, after the word "waive", insert "the defense of lack of authority of the Department of Justice or its officers in making said agreement and"

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

WILLIAM T. BYRNE,

THOMAS J. LANE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

FRANK P. GRAHAM,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1056) for the relief of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House was—

"That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear and determine the claim, together with interest thereon, of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, against the United States for alleged loss and damage suffered by the said Robert A. Watson arising out of certain transactions involving the purchase of three thousand five hundred tons of sugar in the Republic of Argentina in June 1920 the importation into the United States of one thousand nine hundred tons thereof and the neglect, refusal, and failure of the Department of Justice of the United States to provide for the distribution thereof in accordance with the terms of a written agreement between claimant's decedent and said Department; and to enter such decree or judgment against the United States for such loss and damage as equity and justice shall require.

"Sec. 2. In the proceedings upon such claim before the Court of Claims, the United States shall not avail itself of the defense that the Department of Justice of the United States or its officers acted without legal authority in making said agreement or fixing restrictions with regard to the importation and disposition of such sugar.

"Sec. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

The Senate amended the bill striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the following:

"That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear, determine on the merits, and to render in accordance therewith, judgment upon the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods, chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson,

deceased, against the United States for alleged loss and damages suffered by Robert A. Watson arising out of certain transactions between said Robert A. Watson and the Department of Justice of the United States, involving the purchase and importation of sugar from the Republic of Argentina in June 1920, and the alleged neglect, refusal, and failure of the Department of Justice to provide for the distribution thereof in accordance with the terms of a written agreement between claimant's decedent and said Department.

"Sec. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which said court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code: *Provided*, That this Act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States with respect to the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, and not otherwise to effect any substantive rights of the parties."

At the conference the following amendments were agreed upon:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "claim", insert "with such interest as the Court may determine."

On page 2, line 10, after the word "waive", insert "the defense of lack of authority of the Department of Justice or its officers in making said agreement and"

WILLIAM T. BYRNE,

THOMAS J. LANE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered printed.

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Pursuant to section 5 (k) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, I transmit herewith a special joint report of the Federal Security Administrator and the Railroad Retirement Board.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 21, 1950.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1950.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

*Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Yours respectfully,

JAMES B. HARE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 858) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That EDWARD J. ROBESON, Jr., of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 282]

| | | |
|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Allen, Ill. | Heller | Pfeifer, |
| Allen, La. | Herlong | Joseph L. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Hill | Pfeiffer, |
| Angell | Hinschaw | William L. |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Hoffman, Ill. | Philbin |
| Bates, Ky. | Holifield | Plumley |
| Bosone | Javits | Poage |
| Breen | Johnson | Potter |
| Brehm | Jonas | Poulson |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Jones, Mo. | Powell |
| Case, S. Dak. | Keefe | Quinn |
| Celler | Kerr | Rains |
| Chatham | King | Redden |
| Chelf | Klein | Reed, Ill. |
| Christopher | Kunkel | Ribicoff |
| Chudoff | Larcade | Roosevelt |
| Cooley | Lodge | Sabath |
| Coudert | Lyle | Sadlak |
| Davies, N. Y. | Lynch | Sadowski |
| Dawson | McCarthy | Shelley |
| Dingell | McCormack | Smathers |
| Dollinger | McMillen, Ill. | Smith, Ohio |
| Dondero | Mack, Wash. | Tackett |
| Doyle | Magee | Thornberry |
| Eaton | Martin, Iowa | Underwood |
| Ellsworth | Meyer | Van Zandt |
| Engel, Mich. | Miller, Calif. | Vorys |
| Fernandez | Morrison | Vursell |
| Fulton | Moulder | Wadsworth |
| Gillette | Multer | Werdel |
| Gilmer | Murphy | White, Idaho |
| Gordon | Murray, Tenn. | Willis |
| Granger | Nicholson | Withrow |
| Gregory | Nixon | Wood |
| Hall | Noland | Woodhouse |
| Edwin Arthur | Norton | Woodruff |
| Hand | O'Brien, Mich. | Yates |
| Hare | O'Konski | Young |
| Havener | Patten | Zablocki |
| Hébert | Perkins | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 309 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the

amendments in disagreement in the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9526) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951.

The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement, Senate amendment No. 62, which appears on page 24 of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 24, line 19, insert:

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

"For an additional amount for 'Health, Education, and Welfare Services' for the purpose of cooperating with Independent School District No. 5, Cass County, Minn., at Walker, Minn., for the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of public school facilities at Walker, Minn., as authorized by the act of July 1, 1940 (54 Stat. 707, 708), the act of July 24, 1947 (61 Stat. 414), and the act of August 17, 1950 (Public Law 709, 81st Cong.), \$80,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that this motion has been made because it represents one of the most outrageous operations on the part of the bureaucracy in this Government that I have ever heard of. The Congress in 1942 appropriated \$65,000 on the budget estimate for participation with the local school districts in the construction of the schools for these Indians in Minnesota.

In 1949 there was an additional authorization bill and a budget estimate, and instead of \$65,000, \$100,000 was provided. A clause in the agreement says that the plans must be approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The plans which were prepared and submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs provided for leaving out the blackboards in connection with the construction, leaving out all of the plaster except the ceiling plaster, the leaving out of all interior painting, the omission of all insulation from the boiler and heating pipes, and the omission of all finished hardware, as well as omitting \$8,000 of electrical wiring and a large number of other miscellaneous items.

Mr. Nichols, the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, signed an approval of the plan, with all of these items left out, which make it an incomplete and unusable job. The Lord knows what Dillon Myer, the present Indian Commissioner, would do. Perhaps he would have done worse.

Frankly, the local community has been imposed upon by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. On the other hand, it looks as if they wanted to be imposed upon or they would not have left out all of these things which I have described. Now they want \$79,000 more to finish the job. Frankly, I am willing to meet our responsibility toward the education of Indian children, but I do not like this way of doing business. I cannot approve of this kind of business and I hope the Congress will not approve of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take issue with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. What he has just told the House about the \$80,000 in question in this conference report is true. It may be, as he indicated, bad judgment, bad work, or bad planning. But the legislative committee, delegated by the House to consider measures of this sort, met on the 15th of August, after the general appropriation bill had been passed, and the legislative committee heard all the evidence and they voted to approve this \$80,000 item. The appropriation bill, at that time, had already passed through the House and the Senate. There was no way to put it in the bill at that time. There was no use going to the Budget Bureau because the appropriation bill had already passed the House and the Senate. In the conference between the two Houses the Senate put in the \$80,000, and rightfully so. Yesterday we appropriated millions of dollars in this bill to build schools all over this great country, and I was for that. But here is \$80,000 for real Americans, original Americans, native Americans, up in the State of Minnesota. We owe an obligation to these first citizens of ours, and I urge the House to approve this amount. Remember, the Government already has \$100,000 invested in this school building. Are we going to throw this \$100,000 out of the window because somebody failed to do his job? Are we going to let these Indians down at a time they are looking to us for assistance? I do not think we will shirk our responsibility at this time.

I can agree with the gentleman from New York that there may have been bad planning all along the line, but the legislative committee met and authorized the payment of the \$80,000 to finish this job and the appropriation bill had already passed both the House and Senate when that committee met.

I hope the House will approve the \$80,000 requested, and I ask for the approval of this body to this very meritorious, worth while, and necessary request.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 71: Page 28, line 3, insert:

"FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"EXPENSES OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION

"For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, approved September 8, 1950), including personal services in the District of Columbia; printing and binding; health service programs as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rents in the District of Columbia; payment of claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; employment of aliens; exchange and advance of funds without regard to sections 3648 and 3651 of the Revised Statutes; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of

this appropriation; \$60,000,000: *Provided*, That the authorizations, limitations, or restrictions, governing the availability of funds for administrative expenses of Government corporations and other agencies, for the current fiscal year, are hereby waived to such extent as may be determined by the President to be necessary in order for such corporations or agencies to carry out their assigned functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$30,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 78: Page 33, line 3, insert:

"EMERGENCY OPERATING EXPENSES

"For necessary emergency expenses of the General Services Administration not otherwise provided for, for operation, maintenance, protection and repair of public buildings and grounds to the extent that such buildings and grounds are under the control of the General Services Administration for such purposes as are provided for in Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, as amended; including printing and binding; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including repairs, alterations, and improvements necessary for proper use by the Government without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a); restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; furnishings and equipment; and payment of per diem employees employed in connection with any of the foregoing functions at rates approved by the Administrator of General Services or his designee, not exceeding current rates for similar services in places where such services are employed, \$15,740,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$15,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 100: Page 48, line 23, strike out down to and including line 11 in page 49.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment and add, before the period in the last line there-

of, the following: "Provided, however, That the President at any time before the actual delivery of any defense articles to any other country may transfer the same to the United States Department of Defense for the use of such department."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 104: Page 52, line 6, insert:

"Sec. 109. In order more effectively to administer the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize positions to be placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act, and such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act. Grades 16, 17, and 18 now in the Defense Establishment may be increased by an additional number of one-third of each grade now employed in that Establishment."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 109. In order more effectively to administer the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense, subject to the provisions of section 1302 of this act, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize positions to be placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act, and such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act. Under authority herein, grades 16, 17, and 18 now in the Defense Establishment may be increased by an additional number of not more than one-third of each grade now employed in that Establishment."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, amendment 104, which was placed in the bill by the Senate, grants to the President the authority to permit the Department of Defense to employ additional personnel in grades 16, 17, and 18, the salaries of which range from \$11,200 to \$14,000 per annum. Such additional number not to exceed one-third of the number now employed in each of such grades. At the present time I am informed that not to exceed 77 employees can be employed which would limit this provision to the employment of not to exceed 26.

It is not the purpose of the committee in agreeing to this amendment to permit the Department of Defense to make promotions from within Government employees to fill these grades. The purpose of creating these higher grades was to enable the Government to secure the services of specially qualified persons to

perform highly important and technical jobs. The committee proposes to see to it that the authority provided in this amendment is not used as a means for promoting presently employed governmental personnel. I have so instructed the clerk of the subcommittee so there be no abuses of authority herein proposed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 109: Page 53, line 19, insert:

"INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT"

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 414 of the Act for International Development (title IV of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, Public Law 535, 81st Cong., approved June 5, 1950), present employees of the Government may be assigned to duties under that act and the funds appropriated for the purposes of that act by Public Law 759, shall be available to pay the salaries and expenses of such employees pending investigations of such employees by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and reports thereon to the Secretary of State for the period of not to exceed 3 months from the date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 119: Page 58, line 18, insert:

"Sec. 1303. When determined by the President to be necessary, the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, shall not apply, during the current fiscal year, to any appropriations, funds, or contract authorizations, available to the executive departments for carrying out the provisions of the act of August 9, 1950 (Public Law 679); and for the purposes of said act of August 9, 1950, the Secretary of the Treasury may, during the current fiscal year, transfer such amounts as may be necessary from appropriations to the Coast Guard for "Operating expenses", fiscal year 1951, to appropriations to the Coast Guard for "Acquisition, construction, and improvements", and the limitation on number of aircraft on hand at one time, provided in the General Appropriation Act, 1951, shall not apply with respect to said act of August 9, 1950."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARY moves that the House recede from its disagreement of the Senate numbered 119, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 11 of said amendment, after the word "necessary", insert: "(not to exceed \$10,000,000)."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I submitted, and the House Appropriations Committee, the House of Representa-

tives, and the conference committee accepted, the civil-service provisions of this bill. There are a number of reasons why they should be adopted.

First. During the last war the total number of permanent positions and permanent grade classifications was greatly inflated, a condition which has carried over to the present. This serious job inflation which developed during World War II was due to (a) the inability of the Civil Service Commission to control the classification levels of positions, particularly in the defense agencies, and (b) the fact that most appointments, transfers, and promotions of career employees in such defense agencies and elsewhere were made on a permanent basis. As a result positions in the first seven grades, which cover the major portion of Federal employees, were raised several grades during the war on a permanent basis. It is roughly estimated that this has added \$1,000,000,000 per year to the annual payroll costs of the Government. Personnel figures for two of the larger departments of government showing the shift of persons from the lower to the higher grades between 1939 and 1949 are as follows:

| | 1939 | 1945 | 1949 |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Commerce Department: | | | |
| Grades 1, 2, and 3... | Percent 52 | Percent 30 | Percent 21 |
| Grades 5, 6, and 7... | 17 | 40 | 42 |
| State Department: | | | |
| Grades 1, 2, and 3... | 48 | 36 | 20 |
| Grades 4, 5, and 6... | 40 | 49 | 53 |

Why the Civil Service Commission has not already issued regulations to accomplish substantially what this provision provides I do not know. Certainly it should have done so. It has been approximately 3 months since the beginning of the emergency in Korea and no action has been taken by the Commission to meet the situation. While defense agencies have authority to make temporary appointments, evidence received indicates that regular agencies are being required to fill vacancies with permanent appointees, even though the employees leaving for military service or defense work are clearly entitled to reemployment at the end of the emergency. This practice will leave the agencies at the end of the emergency with two permanent employees for each such regular position vacated.

Firm action must be taken now to prevent a repetition of the World War II experience if this Government is to remain solvent. This legislation will result in a saving of from one-half to one billion dollars a year and will permit the Government at the end of the emergency to return easily to its present number of employees at present grade levels, something we were unable to get done after the last war.

Second. One of the worst discriminations which occurred during the last war was against those individuals who went into the military service. Their progress in the Government stopped at the level held upon entrance in the military service. Many of those who stayed behind were promoted rapidly and obtained permanent status at much higher

grades at the end of the war. This provision will eliminate such discrimination in the future by placing all employees of the Government on an equal footing with respect to transfers, promotions and job retention rights.

Third. The problem of recruiting large numbers of experienced people rapidly at the beginning of the last war for defense work was met principally by establishing more generous grades in the defense agencies, rather than by placing all personnel transfers and promotions on an equal footing and encouraging employees to transfer on a temporary basis where they could make their maximum contribution to the war effort. This provision will encourage employees to transfer to military or defense work for patriotic reasons since they can be assured of reemployment rights at the end of the emergency at the same grade and salary held on September 1, 1950, with the further assurance that some employee has not moved into his place on a permanent basis while he helped his country in time of war.

There are a number of technical points which have come to my attention in connection with this provision which I would like to comment on at this time in order to facilitate interpretation and administration of this legislation.

The new language will not interfere with the use of registers of eligibles in making appointments during the emergency period. This method of recruiting should be continued by the commission to assure the highest quality of new appointees. This will be possible even where appointments are temporary, since temporary employment with the Government is as permanent as a position in private industry.

Furthermore, this provision will have no effect on permanent status or retirement privileges of career employees. Acceptance of temporary promotions or transfers by permanent personnel will not change these privileges.

Automatic within-grade promotions will not be affected by this language. Persons affected by reduction in force may be given temporary advances in the regular manner after reinstatement at their last grade and salary.

It is intended that this provision cover the entire Federal service, including agencies exempt from the competitive civil service, such as the FBI and TVA. This provision will not rescind the President's recent order covering certain employees under civil service.

It is my opinion and that of our committee that this legislation is not entirely restrictive and is fair to Federal career employees. In this connection, I wish to reemphasize the fact that all employees will be treated alike under this provision. While promotions will be temporary, those which have been meritoriously made will undoubtedly be made permanent at the end of the emergency, particularly where the position is not required to take care of a person returning from the military or a defense activity.

It does hold the status quo of permanent promotions and positions so that we can take another look at the end of

the emergency, and then do what is right. I believe we must take this action.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 120: Page 59, line 9, insert:

"Sec. 1304. During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which exports or knowingly permits the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration may be used in the manufacture of arms, armaments, or military matériel; and the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration any article or commodity of the nature or class described."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 120, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 1304. During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country whose trade with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea) is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security interests of the United States."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 283]

| | | |
|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Allen, Ill. | Chatham | Engel, Mich. |
| Allen, La. | Chelf | Fellows |
| Anderson, Calif. | Christopher | Fernandez |
| Angell | Chudoff | Fulton |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Cooley | Gamble |
| Bates, Ky. | Coudert | Gillette |
| Blatnik | Davies, N. Y. | Gilmer |
| Bosone | Dawson | Gordon |
| Breen | D'Ewart | Granger |
| Brehm | Dingell | Gregory |
| Brooks | Dollinger | Gwinn |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Doyle | Hall |
| Burke | Durham | Edwin Arthur |
| Case, S. Dak. | Eaton | Hand |
| Celler | Ellsworth | Hare |

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Harris | Martin, Iowa | Redden |
| Havener | Meyer | Reed, Ill. |
| Hays, Ark. | Miles | Ribicoff |
| Hébert | Miller, Calif. | Sabath |
| Heller | Morrison | Sadiak |
| Herter | Moulder | Sadowski |
| Hill | Multer | Shafer |
| Hinshaw | Murphy | Shelley |
| Hoffman, Ill. | Murray, Tenn. | Smith, Ohio |
| Hollfield | Nicholson | Tackett |
| Horan | Nixon | Teague |
| Javits | Noland | Thornberry |
| Jennings | Norton | Underwood |
| Jonas | O'Brien, Mich. | Van Zandt |
| Jones, Mo. | O'Konski | Vorys |
| Keefe | Patten | Vursell |
| Keogh | Perkins | Wadsworth |
| Kerr | Pfeifer | Werdell |
| Klein | Joseph L. | White, Idaho |
| Kunkel | Pfeiffer | Wier |
| Larcade | William L. | Willis |
| Lodge | Philbin | Withrow |
| Lyle | Plumley | Woodhouse |
| Lynch | Poage | Woodruff |
| McCarthy | Potter | Yates |
| McCormack | Poulson | Young |
| McMillen, Ill. | Powell | Zablocki |
| Mack, Wash. | Quinn | |
| Magee | Rains | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 320 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 120 and concur in the same.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is preferential, but I have control of the time. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to divide the motion?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the motion be divided.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment, the last amendment in the bill, is the most ill-conceived, the most inexpedient, the most mischievous in its effect upon our international relations, and the most menacing to world peace that has ever been offered to any appropriation bill within my recollection.

It is opposed and decried by every organized factor in our national economy: High ranking members of the United States Chamber of Commerce oppose it; organized labor opposes it; organized agriculture opposes it; the diplomatic corps opposes it; the highest military authorities oppose it; the President of the United States sends us a letter which will presently be read from the desk in which he analyzes its untoward effect upon our international relations and our efforts to maintain the peace of the world.

The amendment was hastily drawn; so hastily drawn that the author has since sought at every opportunity to change it. In the conference he urged the conferees to agree to a modification,

and asked that when it came to the House, that the House modify it.

It was offered on the floor of the Senate. There were no hearings on it; there was no evidence or testimony of any kind upon it; there were no justifications; no official, either military or diplomatic, was consulted. It sprang, like Minerva, full-grown from the brow of Jove.

But, Mr. Speaker, every major organization in our national economy, motivated by a sense of responsibility and a comprehensive knowledge of the subject and the objectives to be sought, are vigorously and actively opposed to the proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read in my time a telegram from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSTON, TEX.,
September 19, 1950.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman,
House Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of American Federation of Labor, I urge that Wherry amendment to supplemental appropriations bill now pending in Congress be decisively defeated. Wherry amendment if adopted would impose upon western European nations policies which they are not in position to accept. We do not want to interfere with freedom of European nations to shape their economic and political policies. It would be dictatorial to apply sanctions to them. Enactment of Wherry amendment would play into hands of American enemies by destroying assistance which they desperately need at this critical time. I appeal to Members of Congress to defeat Wherry amendment decisively.

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram has been received from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 21, 1950.
HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, House Office Building.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations whilst agreeing wholeheartedly with the wholesome objective that we all seek of preventing the strengthening of the Soviet Union and its satellites is firmly opposed to the proposed Wherry amendment. This is not the way to accomplish our objective but in effect would actually tend to defeat the very aims that we all have at heart.

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. Speaker, communications have also been received from Mr. James Patton, president of the Farmers Union; Mr. Allan Kline, president of the American Federation of the Farm Bureau; Mr. Albert Goss, master of the Farm Grange; and Mr. Fred Heinkle, president of the Missouri Farmers Association, unanimously and emphatically opposing the adoption of the pending amendment.

Mr. Eric Johnston, who served as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and who visited Russia

and toured that country some years ago, urgently insists that the amendment should be defeated.

General Bradley, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and therefore the most eminent military authority in the world, sends the following letter:

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1950.
HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CANNON: The purpose of this letter is to urge you to do your utmost to eliminate the amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill, 1951, which is designed to cut off economic and financial assistance to countries which ship not only arms and armaments but articles or commodities, having military significance, to the Soviet Union or its satellites.

The amendment, in its present form, places upon the Secretary of Defense the responsibility for certifying which commodities fall within its scope. Since this certification is to be based primarily upon military considerations, the Joint Chiefs of Staff will undoubtedly be called upon to advise the Secretary concerning the articles or commodities to be certified by him. The definition of articles or commodities subject to certification is extremely broad. As a consequence, it is my opinion that the administrative burden involved will be disproportionate to the results which this amendment is designed to achieve. In fact, this burden may prove to be such that the amendment will be unworkable.

I believe that the mandatory language of the amendment will seriously handicap the strenuous military efforts which we are now making to build up the collective defensive strength of western Europe. The task of building this military strength rests in no small degree upon our ability to secure the wholehearted cooperation of the western European nations. Cooperation is always a two-way street. It rests upon mutual recognition by each party of problems of the other. I do not believe that we can succeed in our efforts to obtain cooperative action in the military field if we attempt thus to coerce the western Europeans.

While I have directed this letter primarily to the effect of the amendment upon our military objectives in western Europe, it will also have far-reaching consequences on our military programs in other parts of the world.

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption and enforcement of this amendment would be attended by far-reaching consequences of the most drastic and serious character. It would tie the hands of both State and military establishments. It would permit no discretion on the part of either regardless of circumstances or contingencies.

It would disrupt and disorganize the carefully constructed cooperation with our allies on which we must rely for accord and collaboration in the defense of western Europe. We are endeavoring to build up the collective defense strength of the noncommunist nations. It cannot be done by such means as are proposed in this amendment. Coercion will defeat the very ends we seek. We must secure general accord through mutual trust and consideration and that is not to be attained through such implications as are carried in the pending amendment.

Nothing would be gained by such a drastic and arbitrary about face in our foreign policy. As a matter of fact ship-

ments from the Marshall countries to Russia and her satellites have reached an inconsequential residuum. Embargoes have been in effect for the last 2 years and no materials of especial military importance are crossing the borders. And for every item shipped to iron-curtain countries we are receiving in return valuable strategic materials of which we are in short supply. Even on the small scale on which exchange is being made, our returns far outweigh our shipments in relative military value.

But the amendment involves absurd restrictions. It ought to be called the duckfeather amendment. Strange as it may seem duck feathers are on the official list of proscribed materials. They are used in the accouterment of jet airplanes. So, if Italy, for example, should ship 1 pound of duck feathers to Roumania, Italy would thereby become automatically ineligible to economic and financial assistance of any character. If a pound of iron or a reel of wire were transmitted from France to Poland no further economic cooperation with France would be permitted under the Wherry amendment. As will be seen, it would be an administrative monstrosity.

General Bradley says that under a strict interpretation of the amendment, food, buttons, which might be used on uniforms, leather which might be used in army shoes, and so forth would be contraband. In short, the effect of the adoption of the amendment would be to practically suspend trade relations and drive friendly countries, in self preservation, into the Soviet political orbit, thereby increasing decisively the trade and influence of eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment, if adopted, would lead to an impossible situation. It is impracticable, unworkable and destructive of amicable relations with our allies. It endangers our relations with friendly nations without any compensatory advantages whatever. It is fraught with peril to the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak on this question until I heard of the serious situation that is presented to the House. We have just been conducting investigations in executive session where we have had to listen to the testimony of very important officials from the State and the Defense Departments of our Government.

I am here to tell you it would be disastrous if this amendment were to be adopted. With all the earnestness at my command I urge the House to reject this amendment unanimously, because it embodies within its terms possibilities of great evil.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I want to know if I am entitled to time. This is my amendment we are debating.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield for a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, Mr. Speaker, but this is my motion. It is my understanding I am entitled to time on it. There has been so much misrepresentation here I think the House ought to know the facts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi will have time if the gentleman from Missouri yields it to him.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 120 was introduced in the Senate by Senator WHERRY. It was introduced after it became evident that there must be some action on the part of the Congress to prevent the filtering through to the communistic crowd of arms, ammunition, and war matériel. That Senator is entitled to great credit for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. The author of that amendment has provided one thing that is absolutely necessary, and that is not contained in this language that the chairman of the committee has indicated he offers as an amendment: That is, an absolute prohibition to furnish things where they send arms, ammunition, or military matériel. That is something that must be done if we are going to get results.

Now, just to show you the kind of thing this is, and this is not a personal proposition with me: Winston Churchill on August 26 alleged that machine tools were being manufactured in England for the Russians and that 50 Russian inspectors have access to plants where secret British war production is going on. That is an indication, out and out, that action, and affirmative action, on the part of the Congress, is required.

I have prepared with great care a substitute amendment which would take care of the meat of the things that the author of the Senate amendment 120 provided for. I believe that the things I have provided will meet the situation. It absolutely prohibits the giving of aid from the Economic Cooperation Administration to any country that supplies arms, ammunition, or military matériel.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the gentleman understands that no amendment to the pending amendment is in order.

Mr. TABER. Unless we should vote down the previous question, and that, I hope, will be done.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. And also if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is voted down, then it would be in order for the gentleman from New York to offer his amendment as a substitute.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. But until the pending amendment is voted down, no further amendment is in order.

Mr. TABER. Or unless the previous question is voted down.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to call attention to the fact that the last organization of real Americans that I know anything about passing on this matter is the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 15305 and you will see the letter from the head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, where their convention went on record in favor of this Wherry amendment.

Mr. TABER. I think the Wherry amendment can be improved upon to a certain extent. But, there must be included in the language that we adopt the absolute prohibition of aid in the nature of arms, ammunition or war matériel.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the gentleman, but I am not willing to turn our destiny over to the United Nations, those nations that are using our money to trade with Communist Russia. That is what this will do.

Mr. TABER. We must adopt something that will protect the interest of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Absolutely.

Mr. TABER. And that is one thing that we must be sure of. I do not think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri goes far enough to meet the situation.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that the amendment which the gentleman has drafted and which will be offered in case the previous question is voted down, will do what the Wherry amendment was designed to do, namely, stop trade with Russia and her satellites that would be detrimental to our security, but without putting a strait-jacket on the ECA, requiring it to stop all aid to any country that shipped anything that could conceivably be used in the making of arms and armaments?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. It will make it workable and accomplish the objective.

Mr. TABER. It will accomplish the objective and it will do it better.

I submit a copy of the amendment I propose to offer:

Mr. TABER moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter contained in the amendment No. 20 insert the following:

"SEC. 1304. During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall hereafter be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which shall hereafter export or knowingly permit the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms or armament or military matériel or articles or commodities, trade in which is determined by the Secretary of Defense (after consultation with the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration) to be detrimental to the security of the United States; and the Sec-

retary of Defense, after such consultation, is hereby authorized and directed to certify to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the problem now confronting the House of Representatives is a very serious one. I would have no part in impugning the motives of any Member of the House of Representatives on either side of the aisle. There is no doubt but that every Member wants all trade with Russia and the satellite countries eliminated that is not in the best interests of the program for building up western Europe and strengthening the United States. That is undoubtedly the position of all Members of the House and the objectives we are seeking.

If we were in a position to supply all of the requirements of western Europe by way of trade, in other words, if the people of western Europe could buy from us everything they needed to buy and could sell to us everything they needed to sell—if these people could live without any interchange with the rest of the world, that would be one thing, but it is perfectly obvious that a great deal of trade, if western Europe is going to be built up, must take place among the nations of Europe.

There used to be a time when only the rifle and the cannon and a few other things were considered military supplies, but in a modern total war everything must be considered of military significance. Somebody said something about duck feathers. Duck feathers are important. Feathers go into sleeping bags. We have recently ordered thousands of them for our own troops, and we are going to order many more. If Holland should supply a few duck feathers to one of these countries it would be material that could very well be used in a military program. There is hardly anything that is not military material at a time of total war, so we find ourselves in the position, then, of trying to meet a situation with something realistic.

An amendment has been offered which authorizes and directs the National Security Council, made up of the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, Mr. Symington of the National Security Resources Board, and others, to make the decisions with respect to trade with any of these countries and cut off ECA support to any country whose trade is against the best interests of the United States and our defense effort.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The National Security Council, if I am not mistaken, was created by the Eightieth Congress in the National Security Act to handle matters of this kind. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. I believe that is true. It was a good enactment, and in fairness I point out that it was taken when the House was under the control of the Republican Party.

If you were going to enforce an amendment such as the Wherry amendment you would have to have a carpetbagger or a policeman at every factory in western Europe, and you would have to police every border in western Europe and every shipping establishment in order to have complete knowledge of every interchange of goods. It would be an impossible task; it would be an unworkable situation. It would not succeed. It would bring on confusion and chaos and bad feeling. So the substitute amendment which has been offered does give us the protection which we all desire and saves us from a proposal which would do great disservice to our national interests.

When Members come to Congress they begin with their first vote the building of a record. I did it, you did it, we all did it. Speaking only for myself, I have tried to build a record of never having voted during my service here against a program or project designed to strengthen the United States. I am trying to maintain a 100 percent record for promoting the defense of our own country. I may have been wrong in some of my conclusions, but my objective has been the best interest of the United States, and it has no doubt been yours.

Now, what is the national defense picture here for those of us who are anxious to establish or maintain a record of voting for the security of the United States? I do not know of any man in whom I have more faith than General Bradley. He is a down-to-earth wholesome man, a great military man and a statesman of real stature. He has been the key man working with the Western European countries in building up their defenses. Many of the officials of Western Europe have been here, and many of us have greeted them while they were here. General Bradley has a very important task in connection with correlating this work of strengthening Western Europe, because every time Western Europe gets a bit stronger we can relax a little bit in our expenditure of our own American dollars for the maintenance of a free world. What does General Bradley say about the Wherry amendment? I do not know of any higher authority so far as this particular matter is concerned than General Bradley. He says, in a letter to the chairman of the committee:

The purpose of this letter is to urge you to do your utmost to eliminate the amendment.

If you stand with that man, then you are standing certainly on firm ground, and he is talking about something he knows something about. He is not talking about something of which he is ignorant. That would be different. This is a thing he has been giving his life to in recent months. He says he writes to urge you to do your utmost—not to make a gesture, but to do your utmost to eliminate the amendment. I am not going to fly in the face of that admonition in view of all the facts and circumstances. I think most Members of the House will pause and consider well before they do so.

He further proceeds:

I believe that the mandatory language of the amendment will seriously handicap the strenuous military efforts which we are now

making to build up the collective defensive strength of western Europe.

In other words, he says this amendment would throw a monkey-wrench into the machinery which is in operation for the upbuilding of the defenses of western Europe and the strengthening of this country and our efforts to prevent war, or in the event that global war does come our efforts to win such a war. To repeat, he says the amendment would throw a monkey-wrench into the machinery for peace.

Therefore, upon that authority and in view of all the facts and circumstances, those of us who want to cut out all trade which is not in the best interest of the United States can get in the same boat with this man Bradley, and can vote for the substitute amendment which would leave the decision as to trade policies to the National Security Council.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact this material is being supplied to Russia and being supplied by Russia to northern Korea. In other words, the United States is financing both sides of this war at the present time.

Mr. MAHON. So, Mr. Speaker, I leave this case to the conscience of the individual Members of the House. I do not doubt for a moment that we all, on both sides of the aisle, have the same objective. But the Wherry amendment is unworkable. It destroys something that we have spent billions of dollars to build up. Do you know what we have done? We have voted \$5,200,000,000 at this session of the Congress for the military aid program. We have provided \$26,000,000,000 for our own army and navy and air force. To take a step which would destroy the value of what we have spent or authorized thus far is something I do not believe the Members of the House are going to do.

We have got to work together to get the job done on this proposition and in keeping with those who are best advised, and with the man who has the strongest voice in the operations policy of this military-assistance program, General Bradley. So I stand upon that firm foundation, and I believe thoughtful Members of the House who wish to build a voting record that will stand the test of the years will vote against the Wherry amendment and will vote for the substitute which has been offered by the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point for printing in the RECORD the complete text of the letter from Gen. Omar N. Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1950.
HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CANNON: The purpose of this letter is to urge you to do your utmost to eliminate the amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill, 1951, which is designed to cut off economic and financial assistance to countries which ship not only arms and armaments but articles or commodities, hav-

ing military significance, to the Soviet Union or its satellites.

The amendment, in its present form, places upon the Secretary of Defense the responsibility for certifying which commodities fall within its scope. Since this certification is to be based primarily upon military considerations, the Joint Chiefs of Staff will undoubtedly be called upon to advise the Secretary concerning the articles or commodities to be certified by him. The definition of articles or commodities subject to certification is extremely broad. As a consequence, it is my opinion that the administrative burden involved will be disproportionate to the results which this amendment is designed to achieve. In fact, this burden may prove to be such that the amendment will be unworkable.

I believe that the mandatory language of the amendment will seriously handicap the strenuous military efforts which we are now making to build up the collective defensive strength of western Europe. The task of building this military strength rests in no small degree upon our ability to secure the wholehearted cooperation of the western European nations. Cooperation is always a two-way street. It rests upon mutual recognition by each party of problems of the other. I do not believe that we can succeed in our efforts to obtain cooperative action in the military field if we attempt thus to coerce the western Europeans.

While I have directed this letter primarily to the effect of the amendment upon our military objectives in western Europe, it will also have far-reaching consequences on our military programs in other parts of the world.

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am 100 percent in favor of the objective of the Wherry amendment.

I am 100 percent for it, because over the years we have had assurance after assurance that the problem we are concerned with now—the problem of controlling the shipment of arms, armament, and military matériel behind the iron curtain—was being solved; but it never has been solved.

A year ago when I was in Germany, there were several people working on this particular problem. Assurances were given at that time that it would soon be brought under control.

The fact is that it is not yet under control.

Therefore, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I am 100 percent for the objectives sought by the Wherry amendment.

I believe, however, that the language of the amendment can and should be modified.

If the previous question is voted down, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAHER] will offer another alternative to the Wherry amendment. In a word, there will then be before us three variations of language.

There will be the Wherry amendment, which prohibits economic or financial assistance in the event of the known or permitted exportation of "arms or armament or military matériel, or articles or commodities which the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation

Administration may be used in the manufacture of arms, armament, or military matériel."

Then there will be the Cannon amendment which limits the prohibition to those countries whose trade with the U. S. S. R. or its satellites "is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security interests of the United States."

Finally there will be the Taber amendment which will apply the prohibition in the event of the known or permitted exportation "of arms or armaments or military matériel or articles or commodities, trade in which is determined by the Secretary of Defense to be detrimental to the security of the United States."

In my opinion, the language of the original Wherry amendment goes too far. It includes any article or commodity that may be used in the manufacture of arms, armament, or military matériel.

In my opinion, the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] does not begin to go far enough. It speaks only of trade. It says nothing specifically of arms, armament, or military matériel. It is far too general, as far as I am concerned.

In my opinion, the Taber amendment covers the situation adequately. It deals specifically with arms, armament, and matériel and in addition with articles and commodities trade in which is determined to be detrimental to the security interests of the United States.

I hope that the House will vote down the previous question when it is moved, in order to make it possible for the Taber amendment to be presented and approved in place of the original Wherry amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Would the gentleman again state the difference in the language? I do not quite get the difference between the Taber amendment and the Wherry amendment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The Taber amendment prohibition would apply in the event of the exportation of arms or armaments or military matériel, specifically; and in addition, to article or commodities, trade in which is determined by the Secretary of Defense to be detrimental to the security of the United States, and to those articles and commodities only.

The Wherry amendment would apply in respect to any article or commodity which may be used in the manufacture of arms, armament, or military matériel.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is there any question at all in the gentleman's mind that billions of dollars' worth of matériel are going behind the iron curtain today from the United States and from the countries of western Europe?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not know the value of the matériel, but I have no question that it is continuing to go behind the iron curtain.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I have a statement in my possession which shows that in 1949 the western European countries sent behind the iron curtain \$1,242,-

000,000 worth of war matériel, and that the United States in 1949 sent \$207,000,000. How can we possibly justify these figures to the boys who are fighting in the fox holes of Korea?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think it is obvious and has long been obvious that the situation must be controlled. Those countries which we are aiding must understand our position in the matter.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman also state the amount of rare commodities and materials which we secured in exchange which were worth much more from a military point of view than the commodities we sent them?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], a member of the committee.

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article relative to the proposed amendment.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I support the proposed Taber amendment and urge its adoption because I feel that this measure should put a prohibition upon the sending of potential war matériel to our potential enemies. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of documentary proof that a tremendous amount of this matériel is going to Russia and her satellites from countries that are receiving Marshall plan funds. Some of these tables inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Members of the House and Members of the other body, indicate that more than a billion dollars worth of potential war matériel has been shipped to Russia and her satellites from the United States and Marshall plan countries in a period of 12 months. We are told that it is now proposed to extend Marshall plan aid to not only 14 nations, but to 40 nations, and not with an estimated outlay of \$5,000,000,000 in the first year, and then taper off to smaller amounts, but will start with \$10,000,000,000.

I, therefore, see no reason why this House should not approve the Wherry amendment as proposed to be amended by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to give the Secretary of Defense the power to stop shipment of potential war matériel to potential enemies, from the United States and countries that receive large amounts of money supplied by the taxpayers of the United States. Certainly the men who are fighting communism in Korea and who have seen Russian-made machine guns and other equipment made in satellite countries, at the war front would approve the means of excluding American tax dollars from the production of weapons of war for use by our Communist enemies. The casualty list from the war front today is such that it convinces me that any argument against the stopping of the flow of potential war matériel into the hands of enemies shooting at our own soldiers is a weak argument.

As this Congress is about to recess, I call attention to the fact that some real answer must be made to the people and

the taxpayers regarding the condition of their Treasury and how careful a check we are keeping on the expenditure of their money. We are about to complete consideration of the tax bill which will increase the taxes of the people by \$5,000,000,000 and we are told this will be followed by an excess-profits tax, adding another \$5,000,000,000. The result will be that the people of the United States are to be the most heavily taxed individuals in the world. Very little is being said about our public debt which at the present time is close to \$260,000,000,000, and I am informed that the indirect debt would carry it to over \$20,000,000,000 more. We will soon start spending the \$30,000,000,000 which we have appropriated for National Defense which will mean a deficit of \$5,000,000,000 or \$7,000,000,000 and that deficit is bound to increase as our defense expenditures jump to \$40,000,000,000 or \$50,000,000,000 a year as has been predicted.

It appears that another supplemental appropriation bill is on the way and that it will run between \$10,000,000,000 and \$20,000,000,000. This bolsters my argument that it is time to check and double-check our expenditures and if our objective is to fight communism, there is no reason why an amendment such as is now proposed, should not be placed in this bill to stop United States dollars from adding to Communist power.

Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Administrator of ECA, who I am happy to report has regained good health after a serious surgical operation. I was with Mr. Hoffman at the first meeting of the 16 foreign ministers and heard Mr. Hoffman lay the conditions of the ECA program down to these foreign ministers in no uncertain terms. I realize that there are many things which cannot be publicly said while dealing with foreign governments. Mr. Hoffman is the last man who would want war material to be shipped to our present or potential enemies. His son is in the service and two others are in the Reserves ready to be called. Paul Hoffman is a great American and this debate is in no way a criticism upon his patriotism, loyalty, or efficiency. I feel that now we are at war, Mr. Hoffman would not object to some kind of amendment to this bill which would strengthen his hand. Several amendments have been shown to me. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], in my opinion, does not go far enough. The difference between the proposed Taber amendment and the Cannon amendment is that the Cannon amendment does not prohibit the shipment of arms and material of war. On the other hand, the Taber amendment specifies arms and is in fact a prohibition against the shipment of arms and material of war. The Taber amendment, also, in my opinion, carries out the principles embodied in the Wherry amendment. The House is now confronted with this proposition. The Taber amendment is not before it for consideration but will be permitted for consideration if the Cannon amendment is voted down. Therefore, I feel that in order to strengthen our arm against communism, the House should vote down the Cannon

amendment and then be given the opportunity to vote on the Taber amendment. If the Cannon amendment succeeds in passing, then all we have left to do is to urge the conferees, when they get together in conference with the Senate, to strengthen the Cannon amendment by adopting some of the phraseology embodied in the Taber and Wherry amendments.

By leave granted me, I include the Cannon amendment and also the Taber amendment:

CANNON AMENDMENT

SEC. 1304. During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country whose trade with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea) is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security interests of the United States.

PROPOSED TABER AMENDMENT

MR. TABER moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter contained in the amendment No. 20 insert the following:

"SEC. 1304. During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall hereafter be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country which shall hereafter export or knowingly permit the exportation of, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China and Communist North Korea), arms or armament or military material or articles or commodities, trade in which is determined by the Secretary of Defense (after consultation with the Administration of the Economic Cooperation Administration) to be detrimental to the security of the United States; and the Secretary of Defense, after such consultation, is hereby authorized and directed to so certify to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration."

MR. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

MR. JUDD. Is it not true that almost nobody here is asking approval of the Wherry amendment as such? We believe it goes too far and is unworkable. There is no point in beating the Wherry amendment, except to put in its place an amendment that will better do the job.

MR. STEFAN. We believe in the objectives of it, however, and we are trying to improve it. If we vote down the previous question on the Cannon amendment and consider the Taber amendment that should pass.

MR. SPEAKER, newspapers and magazines have been filled with stories about "war-goods pipeline to Russia." The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been filled with tables placed therein by Members of both bodies indicating that the loop-

holes to Russia and her satellites have not been closed against the movement of potential arms and ammunition from ECA countries. I do not wish to burden the RECORD with voluminous articles, but two of them have unusual significance and, by leave granted me, I include the article appearing in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald for Monday, September 4 and the article in the United States News and World Report of recent date: [From the Omaha (Nebr.) Morning World-Herald of September 4, 1950]

UNITED STATES COPPER GOES TO REDS—SHIPPED FROM BRITAIN IN GENERATORS

LONDON.—A number of the large generators now installed or being installed in Russia and a number of motors and other electrical appliances going into Russia's new factories undoubtedly contain copper sent to Britain as a gift from the American taxpayer, it was learned Sunday night.

The facts are these:

During the 29 months of the Marshall program, copper valued at about \$375,000,000 has been imported by the British Government. More than one-fourth of the copper—or \$97,600,000 worth—was paid for by the American Government with Marshall funds.

ARRIVED IN WAREHOUSES

ECA inspectors checked to make certain the American-bought copper arrived in Government warehouses but from then on could follow the metals no longer.

The British Government sold its total copper supply, including the American gift copper, to British manufacturers. Large quantities went to electrical manufacturers.

During the period of Marshall aid, Britain has sent to Russia generators worth more than \$30,000,000, motors and similar equipment worth another seven million, and electrical appliances worth another \$3,500,000.

TOTAL EXCEEDS ONE HUNDRED MILLION

Sales of other machinery, most of which contained substantial amounts of copper, brought British shipments to Russia of copper using goods up to more than fifty-five millions during the Marshall period time.

If there are added sales during the earlier postwar months, when Britain was living off the \$3,750,000,000 American gift loan, the total exceeds \$100,000,000.

Because all copper went into one big pool, it can be assumed that since American taxpayers provided more than a fourth of Britain's total copper supply more than a fourth of the British-made copper-using goods sent to Russia contain gift copper from America. In modern industry, a nation's war potential depends largely on electrical capacity.

[From the United States News and World Report of September 22, 1950]

WAR-GOODS PIPELINE TO RUSSIA—WEST PERMITS HUGE LEAKS THROUGH SATELLITES

Tools and machinery are rolling into Russia from the west. Goods are moving through, and around, allied embargoes.

British trade is only a small part of total. Soviet agents are buying German steel, Italian bearings, French TNT, etc.

United States is trying to cut off shipments of war-related products. But plugging all the east-west loopholes looks impossible.

BERLIN

West German industrialists, often aided by German officials, are shipping millions of dollars' worth of contraband goods related to war making to Russia and her allies. The illegal trade has reached such alarming proportions that it is turning the German Ruhr into one of Russia's secondary arsenals, in the words of a British intelligence officer.

The Communists are getting such contraband supplies as seamless steel tubing, ball bearings, machine tools, precision instru-

ments, special steels, rolling-mill equipment, chemicals, trucks, and other gear useful in building up the war potential of the Soviet bloc.

Russia does no direct buying. Instead the Kremlin uses its satellites as purchasing agents and obtains other supplies through brokers in such scattered places as Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Austria, and Hong Kong. The biggest leak is across the lightly patrolled border between east and west Germany.

So loose is the German export-control system that allied authorities can't find out precisely what goods are moving eastward. Records are so confused that they reveal nothing. Valuable machine parts appear as scrap. Seamless steel tubing is listed as iron pipe. Industrial diamonds show in the records as precious gems.

Recently a big Ruhr firm was caught illegally shipping steel tubing to an east German trading company by wrapping the tubing in aluminum wire and declaring it as aluminum cable for export. A large Kiel firm has been shipping port equipment to Antwerp and Rotterdam, but intelligence officers discovered it was winding up in the east German port of Rostock. Four Ruhr firms recently sold contraband steel to Soviet purchasers through a \$2,300,000 deal set up in Switzerland.

The big increase in shipments of goods related to war began last winter when the allies turned over export controls to the German Government. Most of the illegal shipments have gone out covered by legal documents. Customs inspection at West German borders has detected few of the false declarations. Shipments to East Germany get a cursory inspection. Shipments from West Germany to Berlin by highway are examined only occasionally and railroad cargoes go virtually uninspected.

Total West German shipments to Soviet-bloc areas now are running at upward of \$200,000,000 a year. The biggest flow is to Communist-dominated East Germany. Shipments under an East-West German trade agreement have amounted to \$50,000,000 in the last 11 months. Goods worth probably twice that amount have moved outside the trade agreement. West German exports to Communist countries other than East Germany are running at a rate of \$74,000,000 a year, twice as high as last year. Hungary is the biggest customer.

Some German firms are doing business with the Communists for political reasons—they think they are buying "insurance" against a Communist take-over in West Germany. Mostly, however, the deals are simply a matter of profit. Russia's agents pay good prices. They keep their promises and pay off promptly, usually on a cash-and-carry basis. German companies know they face hard competition in western markets—so they turn to the easy and lucrative markets in the east.

American and British officials here are convinced that halfway export controls, now being applied, can never be effective in Germany. They believe the only way to stop war-contraband shipments to the east is to launch all-out economic warfare, virtually cutting off all trade. But that would shoot sky high the costs of supporting the West Germans, a step the western allies are not yet prepared to take.

LONDON

The suspicion is growing abroad that the countries the United States is strengthening against Russia are, in turn, helping the Russians get ready for war.

Britain's Labor Government, prodded by Winston Churchill, is halting deliveries of military equipment, including jet planes, which have been going to countries outside the North Atlantic Pact. It is reexamining contracted shipments of British-made machines and materials to east Europe. British businessmen themselves are complaining

about the deals that force them to do business with Moscow.

Facts behind these complaints show how the Russians are dickering all around the world to get the war equipment they can't buy from the United States.

In the first 4 months of this year, the British sent Russia a million dollars' worth of machine tools—10 times the quantity exported in the same months of 1949. Russian contracts are taking between 10 and 15 percent of Britain's production of heavy machine tools at a time when machine tools of other types are being delivered to the British by the United States.

Deliveries of British electrical generators to the Soviet Union ran 50 percent ahead of the 1949 rate in the first 4 months of this year.

British-made Diesel engines have been going to Russia under a \$15,400,000 contract. The Russians also have contracted for \$5,000,000 worth of mining equipment and big machine presses.

Russia is buying British-controlled rubber at the rate of 240,000 tons a year. Purchases so far this year already exceed the total bought in 1949. Satellite Czechoslovakia is buying up rubber at the rate of 200 tons a day.

Most of the British goods going to east Europe is being delivered now under trade agreements made 2 and 3 years ago. The argument of some Britons is that Russia is going to get machine tools one place or another, so Britain might as well have the business. The Russians, in turn, are sending grain and timber to the British—essentials that would have to be bought elsewhere with scarce dollars if Russian-British trade ended.

What worries some military men more than the current Russian-British trade is the fact that the Russians managed to buy about 50 of Britain's better jet engines before their export was banned 2 years ago. One aviation expert says that copying the engines and putting them into mass production may have given the Russians one of the biggest, fastest jet-fighter forces in the world.

There is talk now that Britain might embargo shipments to Communist-controlled countries if they take equipment needed for rearmament at home. As it stands, Britain forbids the sale to Russia of war implements or war-useful machines. But the British list is not as strict as that of the United States. So some of the things Russia can't buy in America have been going Russia's way after a little careful shopping in Britain.

PARIS

By one means or another, the Russians are getting everything from electric motors to explosives from France. A steady supply of war-making machinery is moving under the iron curtain to Russia and her Communist neighbors.

No guns, tanks, munitions, or planes get through from France. Arms shipments are banned. But much of the material Russia buys—either directly or through intermediaries—can be converted quickly for use in war industry or for actual combat gear.

Such things as machine tools, industrial machinery, abrasives, iron and steel wire and tubing, boilers, pumps, motors, automobiles, railroad equipment, electrical equipment and metals of all kinds are sold with the permission of the French Government. By roundabout channels the Russians also are managing to get such war essentials as ball bearings, industrial alcohol and TNT. Traders in neutral countries are used as the go-betweens. There is no way to estimate the size of this trade.

Western Europe has sharply increased exports of such items as bearings, metals and machine tools since the United States stopped selling them to Russia's part of the world 2 years ago.

France recently received about \$6,000,000 worth of lead from the United States through the Marshall plan—and lead is one of the

biggest items in France's exports to Russia. One Italian plant that has received large amounts of Marshall plan aid makes ball bearings, many of which, some observers fear, fall into Russian hands. Italian gear-cutting machinery is another suspected export.

Not long ago a \$118,000 machine tool big enough to make rocket launchers left the United States for Rotterdam. It continued on through until it reached a destination behind the iron curtain.

French exports directly to eastern European countries, excluding Russia, doubled from 1948 to 1949. France sent \$75,000,000 worth of goods to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia in 1949, against \$37,000,000 in 1948. Actual trade with Russia is small, but much of the machinery and material sold to the satellites ends up in the Soviet Union.

A new United States policy to crack down on friendly countries sending goods potentially useful in war to eastern Europe may tighten trade regulations between west and east. But, up to now, much of the stuff needed to build a war industry is still moving to Russia.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

DEMOCRATS WANT TO DO BUSINESS WITH RUSSIA AS USUAL—SOLDIERS DO NOT UNDERSTAND THIS INCONSISTENCY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the amendment seeks to deny economic or financial assistance to any foreign country which shall knowingly export or permit to be exported arms or military material or other commodities to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or to any of its satellite countries.

On two previous occasions Mr. Speaker, I have addressed the House and called attention to the shipment of tools and machinery that was going into Russia directly and indirectly through the satellite countries from the United States and our western European allies. I pointed out at that time that the trade in heavy machine tools, power generators, mining equipment, machine presses, automobiles, railroad equipment, electrical equipment and industrial machinery went behind the iron curtain from Britain and France and other countries to the tune of almost a billion and a half dollars in 1949. In that same period the United States shipped behind the iron curtain \$207,000,000 worth of the same kind of material.

Mr. Speaker, there is reliable information coming out of Berlin to the effect that west German industrialists are shipping millions of dollars of contraband goods related to war-making to Russia and her allies. This illegal trade has reached such alarming proportions that it is turning the German Ruhr into one of Russia's secondary arsenals according to a report by a British intelligence officer. I repeat again that the Communists are getting such contraband supplies as seamless steel tubing, ball bearings, machine tools, precision instruments, special steels, rolling mill equipment, chemicals, trucks and other gear useful in building up the war potential of the Soviet bloc. It is true that Russia does not

direct buying, instead the Kremlin uses its satellites as purchasing agents and obtains other supplies through brokers in such scattered places as Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Austria and Hong Kong. But the biggest leak is across the lightly patrolled border between east and west Germany.

Mr. Speaker, a report from London is to the effect that there is a growing suspicion that the countries the United States is strengthening against Russia are in turn helping Russia get ready for the next war. Recently Winston Churchill prodded Britain's Labor Government and accused it of working against the interest of the United States and its allies. According to a United States News and World report it appears that the Russians are attempting to buy war equipment from other countries that they cannot buy directly from us. It is reported that in the first 4 months of this year the British sent to Russia a million dollars' worth of machine tools, 10 times the quantity reported in the same months of 1949. Russian contracts are taking between 10 and 15 percent of Britain's production of heavy machine tools at the time when machine tools of other types are being delivered to the British by the United States. Just think of it, deliveries of British electrical generators to the Soviet Union ran 50 percent ahead of 1949 in the first 4 months of this year. In addition, Russia is said to be buying British-controlled rubber at the rate of 240,000 tons a year. Purchases so far this year exceeded the total purchased in 1949. Satellite Czechoslovakia is buying rubber at the rate of 200 tons a day. The British defend their position, Mr. Speaker, by saying that all British goods shipped to east Europe are being delivered under trade agreements made 2 and 3 years ago, and they contend that Russia is going to get machine tools from someone so why not from the British. Business as usual.

When we consider, Mr. Speaker, that Russia has managed to buy about 50 percent of Britain's better jet engines before a ban was made we can appreciate that we are placing in the hands of an avowed enemy the potential equipment that someday will be used to kill our sons.

Mr. Speaker, from Paris comes the report that the Russians are getting everything, from electrical motors to explosives from France. A steady supply of war-making machinery is moving under the iron curtain to Russia and her Communist neighbors, according to a United States News and World Report of September 22. This magazine reports that such things as machine tools, industrial machinery, abrasives, iron and steel wire and tubing, boilers, pumps, motors, automobiles, railroad equipment, electrical equipment, and materials of all kinds are sold with the permission of the French Government. Again not directly, but through roundabout channels as traders in neutral countries are used as the go-betweens. Actually there is no way to estimate the size of this trade.

France recently received about \$6,000,000 worth of lead from the United States through the Marshall plan, and lead is one of the biggest items in France's exports to Russia. One Italian plant that has received large amounts of Marshall-

plan aid makes ball bearings, many of which, some observers fear, fall into Russian hands. Italian gear-cutting machinery is another suspected export. Not long ago a \$118,000 machine tool big enough to make rocket launchers left the United States for Rotterdam. It continued on through until it reached a destination behind the iron curtain.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the same position today with reference to Russia as we were 10 years ago with Japan. I well remember, 10 years ago, when our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], who had just returned from China, went back and forth across this country calling attention to the fact that the scrap iron, the oil and gasoline that we were sending to Japan would be used against us in the event of a war with that country. He personally presented his case to President Roosevelt. We know what happened, and we acknowledged the error of our ways. Are we so naive at this date and in view of our previous experience to think that it is still good business to provide our potential enemy with the sinews of war? How can you explain that satisfactorily to the mothers and fathers of the boys who are dying and who are about to die when that war with Soviet Russia comes? I respectfully urge the adoption of the amendment that I have offered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Rankin].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I brought this question up because our boys are dying by the thousands in Korea as the result of this trading with Russia. They are being killed by machinery, by instruments, that are either manufactured in the United States or are paid for with American money. The American people are not willing for us to continue to finance that gang behind the iron curtain and have them supply the instruments of destruction to kill our boys on foreign soil.

The supporters of this Cannon amendment seem to have had letters or telegrams from everybody except Harry Bridges. I have not heard a telegram from Harry Bridges read yet. It will probably come later.

But, I want to read you a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Every member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has served in a war and on foreign soil. This letter was sent to several Members, but especially one was addressed to me. The letter reads as follows:

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is my understanding that on Wednesday, September 20, 1950, the House of Representatives will take up for consideration the conference report on the bill H. R. 9526, providing for supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes. It is also my understanding that the House will consider by separate vote the so-called Wherry amendment, which would deny economic or financial assistance to any country permitting the exportation of arms, armament, or military material to the Soviet Union or any so-called Soviet satellite country.

Now, do not let these fellows get the feathers in your eyes that they have been talking about. This is not a feather question; it is a question of supplying the matériel that goes to destroy America.

The Fifty-first National Encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, meeting in Chicago, Ill., August 27 to September 1, 1950, had under consideration the subject matter of the Wherry amendment. Subsequently, the encampment adopted a 10-point security program, one of which would recommend to the President and the Congress that economic aid under the Marshall plan be withdrawn immediately from any nation supplying such strategic or essential materials to Soviet Russia and/or her satellites.

The amendment should and ought to commend itself to the favorable consideration of the Congress. How can we rehabilitate the economy of a nation within the framework of democratic capitalism if the nation's trade in turn enhances the growth of an economic and ideological system which is the antithesis of ours? Are we not then nurturing the seeds of our own destruction? If the economic rehabilitation of any democratic country is dependent upon the maintenance of traffic in arms, armament, or other military material with a nation behind the iron curtain, then the Congress may as well pause to reconsider the soundness of the whole European recovery program.

This paradox of the taxes of our people directly or indirectly strengthening the war potential of Soviet Russia and her satanic entente can be resolved only by the Congress taking a firm stand in support of the Wherry amendment.

In behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I strongly urge that you vote for this amendment when the conference report on H. R. 9526 is considered in the House on Wednesday, September 20, 1950.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM, Director.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman knows—and I say this to him as one of the conferees present at the conference—on this bill—that the author of the Wherry amendment, of which he is speaking, sought to amend it in conference, and thereby admitted that it was improperly drawn.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, but he did not admit its destruction, which the Cannon amendment would do.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Cannon substitute is voted down. If it is substituted for the Wherry amendment, it will probably cost the lives of a hundred thousand American boys.

If we can defeat this Cannon substitute, then I feel sure we can adopt the Wherry amendment, or the Taber substitute, which carries out the intent of the Wherry amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this matter of stopping the shipment of war supplies and war potentialities to Russia and her satellite countries is one that I feel most keenly about. In fact, at the

risk of being considered self-serving, I remind the older Members of the House and call the attention of the newer ones to the fact that in 1945 the postwar policy committee of the House, of which I had the honor to serve as chairman, recommended that a board be set up to screen the shipments to Russia and her satellites. This was a few months after the cessation of hostilities and immediately after my committee had spent 2 months in Europe, 2 weeks of which time were spent in Russia in an on-the-spot study of world conditions.

Subsequently, in March 1947 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 36, which would have stopped, if enacted into law, the appeasement policy of Russia and among other things (a) insured the registration, screening, and means of control of all contracts made with these governments by citizens and others within the jurisdiction of the United States, including contracts for the acquisition of technical processes, engineering and other skills, and the production know-how of industrial processes, and (b) controlled deliveries of goods to such governments produced under such contracts where necessary to protect the national security.

Again, in the consideration of the original as well as the subsequent Marshall-aid bills, I offered amendments which, in substance, were similar to the so-called Wherry amendment under consideration here today. One of those amendments was adopted by the House, but later was nullified in the Senate.

It, therefore, follows, Mr. Speaker, that I shall vote against the previous question in order that the Wherry amendment may be voted on by this House or in its stead the Taber amendment which is, in my judgment, an improvement on the Wherry amendment. Should the previous question prevail, of course, under the parliamentary situation, there would be nothing left but the amendment offered by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon]. I do not favor the Cannon amendment because, again, it is more appeasement. However, it is certainly better than no law, and I shall vote for it rather than to have no pronouncement by the Congress on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion permit me to say to you and my colleagues that it is unthinkable to me that we should not attach proper restrictions to the money, which we are giving to the European nations for the defeat of communism, when those restrictions, such as the one which we are now discussing, are in our own national interest. Too long have we expended our wealth and denied our people at home in order to help the peoples of Europe in their fight against communism without protecting our own national interest. It simply does not make good nonsense to send money and materials to European nations and then permit those nations to use that money and those materials in trading with the enemy of free peoples, Russia and her satellites. I hope this House will vote down the previous question and give the House an opportunity to vote on the Wherry and Taber amendments.

ECA FUNDS SHOULD NOT BE USED TO BUY WAR GOODS FOR RUSSIA

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of and support the amendment in the conference report on H. R. 9526, the supplemental appropriations bill, to prohibit economic or financial assistance to countries who export to Russia or its satellites arms, armament, or military matériel or articles or commodities used in the manufacture of arms, armament, or military matériel.

During the first 4 months of 1950 the British Empire exported more than \$6,000,000 worth of electrical machinery to Russia. It also sent to Russia more than \$1,000,000 worth of machine tools, which was almost 10 times as many machine tools as were exported by the British Empire to Russia during the same period in 1949.

Recently the press reported that the managing director of the second largest tool-manufacturing concern in Great Britain had stated that his organization was so taken up with orders for Russia that it could not furnish any material—not even so much as a pin—to any British consumer for 2 years.

During 1949 Belgium, Luxemburg, France, and the United Kingdom exported to Russia and her satellite nations millions of dollars worth of arms, explosives, iron, steel, aluminum, brass, copper, lead, zinc, tin, electrical goods, machinery, motor vehicles, automobile tires, chemicals, transportation equipment, and optical, surgical, scientific, and photographic instruments and apparatus.

Under the situation which has developed within recent months in Korea it does not appear that the American taxpayers should be furnishing economic aid under the ECA to countries who are using American assistance to purchase material which eventually will turn up in Russia or its satellites as war goods.

It has been known for some time that ECA countries are exporting to Russia and her satellite nations certain materials which the Secretary of Commerce will not permit to be exported from this country.

The effect of this amendment under consideration would merely charge the Secretary of Defense and the National Security Board with the responsibility of making certain that export of any one of the ECA countries to Russia or her satellites is not useful in the manufacture of arms, armament, or military matériel. The amendment does not prevent free trade between the countries of the world, but is an assurance to the American people that the billions of dollars which we are providing the democracies of the world will not be used to put bullets and shells in the guns of the northern Koreans for the slaughter of our boys. Also, it means that it will be made certain that the democracies of the world will not unwittingly aid the Communist nations in building up an

arsenal to be used against us at some future date.

Within the past few weeks I have received many letters from constituents who have read alarming reports in the newspapers as to the exports which Great Britain has made or is making to Russia. The assumption is that these exports are being purchased with American dollars provided under ECA funds. It is difficult to explain why the United States must spend, during fiscal year 1951, approximately \$32,000,000,000 in national defense and at the same time provide funds to the democracies of the world for them, in turn, to ship vital equipment to the Communist countries.

It is regrettable this action comes too late to prevent damage already done by our foreign relations advisers who seem to have faith in the actions of Communist countries. I trust the approval of this legislation will have a salutary effect upon Communist nations and their satellites.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House has fought any harder to stop the flow of war materials into Russia and the satellite countries than I. My distinguished friends, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who are members of the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the State and Commerce Departments, will, I am certain, substantiate that fact. In the Eightieth Congress, when I served on that committee, time and again I questioned the State and Commerce Department representatives who appeared before our committee, and our committee insisted that this trade cease.

I do not think we have done a bad job in this respect. When the ECA was created, the Congress gave the director of that organization one of the most difficult tasks that has ever been assigned to any public administrator. He was dealing with 18 to 20 different countries. All of those countries at that time were sending materials into Russia, as was also the United States. The flow of materials into the Communist countries at that time was in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Our trade is divided generally into three classes. The first class we will call the triple-A class, which consists of arms, ammunition, and atomic energy materials. The shipping of that class of materials has stopped altogether today. The ECA Administrator has been able, not by using the bludgeon of coercion, as the Wherry amendment would require him to do, but by working with these countries and obtaining their co-operation, to get them to stop even the slightest trickle of arms, ammunition, and atomic energy materials into the Communist countries.

The second classification is high-priority materials other than arms, ammunition, and atomic energy materials. The ECA Administrator has cut the flow of those materials into Communist countries to less than 10 percent of the amount it was when he took over. That 10 percent represents items which are of

questionable classification. Some of them are materials which the United States considers would aid the Soviet Union, while some of the other countries disagree. The proper agencies are engaged at this very moment in working out those items so that we can determine which of the items should fall in the classification of strategic materials so that every dollar of those materials may be stopped.

There is a third class which are not strategic materials, but which may be used indirectly and remotely in the prosecution of war.

That is where the duck feathers come in. The reference to duck feathers is not a jest at all. That has been one of the items of serious consideration in classification. Duck feathers can be used to manufacture warm clothing for aviators. Under the Wherry amendment I tell you that if Holland sent 100 pounds of duck feathers into Poland the ECA Administrator would be required immediately to stop all aid to Holland. Now you do not want that.

I am in absolute accord with the purposes of the Wherry amendment, but I say to you it does not accomplish even what its author seeks to accomplish.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The trouble with the Cannon amendment is that it does not meet the picture.

Mr. GARY. The Cannon amendment does this, which I think is proper. The Eightieth Congress, which was a Republican-controlled Congress, passed the National Defense Act, and that act sets up the National Security Council to perfect the national defenses and prosecute war. The Cannon amendment gives the National Security Council the power, whenever any country is dealing with one of the Communist countries in a manner which is detrimental to the security interests of this country, to stop all aid to that country.

On this third classification which I have mentioned, in which the commodities are not strategic materials, we have not tried to stop trade. There must be some trade between the east and the west. What we have considered in that respect is whether or not, when we send any of those materials into Russia, we can get materials which we need in return so that in the final analysis the balance, so far as strengthening the war effort, will be on our side.

For example, just let me cite to you one example: There has been a great deal of talk about a shipment to Russia of 60 locomotives of 35,000 tons each from Italy. What did Italy get in return for those 60 locomotives? That is the thing you do not hear anything about. Italy received 200,000 tons of iron ore, 20,000 tons of manganese, 2,500 tons of asbestos, 100,000 tons of pig iron, 75,000 tons of steel ingots, 100,000 tons of petroleum, 3,000 tons of copper, 800 tons of nickel, 300,000 tons of high-grade wheat. Those are the things that Italy needs to rehabilitate her economy and to strengthen and increase her war potential to the point that they can be helpful allies to us in time of war.

Do you not think that was a good trade? Somebody has to pass on whether the trade is good or bad on these non-strategic items. Frankly I want to say to you, and I have made this statement on the floor time and time again, that in my judgment the Director of the ECA is one of the ablest administrators in the entire United States. I think he has done a magnificent job in handling this flow of strategic materials to other countries.

If we cut that trade off altogether, then what would happen? We have either to supply those countries or they go without. If we supply them, the materials must be paid for out of the taxpayers' pockets in this country. Manganese and certain items of that kind we cannot supply because we are in short supply ourselves.

I have before me a letter from the President of the United States with reference to this question which I consider to be one of the most important problems which this Congress has faced during this entire session. I want to read it to you. It was addressed to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1950.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When the Senate passed H. R. 9526, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1951, it added an amendment, offered by Senator WHERRY, which would require the United States to cut off economic and financial assistance to all countries which export to the Soviet Union or its satellites any articles which might be used for the production of military matériel. This amendment is of such grave importance, and is fraught with such danger to the United States and to world peace, that I feel I must make a special request to the Congress to eliminate it in completing action upon this bill.

No one can quarrel with the ostensible purpose of the amendment—to weaken the war-making potential of Communist-dominated countries—and on the surface the amendment may seem to be a plausible means for accomplishing that end. But the fact is that it would defeat its own purpose and accomplish substantially the opposite result from that intended—it would weaken the free nations more than it would weaken the Soviet bloc.

The amendment applies not only to arms and armaments but to any articles that could be used for the production of military matériel. Since almost all goods and commodities can be used for the production of military matériel in one way or another, the amendment, if effective, would require a substantially complete embargo on trade between western and eastern Europe. The countries participating in the European recovery program have embargoed the export of arms and armaments to eastern Europe for some 2 years. But trade in other commodities has continued to some extent. This trade works both ways, of course. Countries of western Europe obtain from it goods which are vital to their economic and military strength—the very strength we are helping to build up. To cut this trade off suddenly would bring about dislocations in the western nations that would more than offset any advantages that might be gained.

The appropriate agencies of the Government have been negotiating, and will continue to negotiate, with countries receiving aid from us in order to curb trade that would aid the war potential of the Soviet bloc, and to do this in a way that would protect the

strength of friendly nations. These negotiations have produced very substantial results, and I am confident they will continue to do so. This method, which permits selective and cooperative treatment of the host of varying problems in this field, is far superior to the arbitrary blanket approach prescribed in the amendment now in question.

The amendment affects countries in the Near East and Far East, as well as in Europe. Some of these countries do not have strong traditional ties with the western world. It is important to us to develop and strengthen these ties, which is one of the aims of our assistance programs. While they are friendly to the United States, the trade of those countries with the Soviet Union may be so important to them economically that they would have no alternative but to forego the limited economic aid which we now make available to them. The amendment leaves no room for negotiation, and accordingly would tend to force such countries into the Soviet orbit, in spite of their friendship for the United States. The amendment would also have most unfortunate effects on our relations with the Latin-American countries. I am sure these are results wanted by nobody who supports the amendment.

Before legislation of this character is adopted, we ought to be sure that we would get more out of it than we would lose. I am convinced that this amendment in its present form would not accomplish the purpose intended but, on the contrary, would do much more harm than good.

Consequently, I earnestly urge the Congress to leave the amendment out of the bill.

I am sending a similar letter to Senator MCKELLAR.

Sincerely,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has expired.

AMENDMENT 120 TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment now under consideration was adopted by the Senate because of certain existing conditions that make it imperative that something be done. The fact is that critical and strategic material shipped from this country is reaching Russia or its satellite countries.

The demand that this practice be stopped grows out of the experience we gained from World War II. Prior to that war you will all remember that we shipped scrap iron to Japan that was returned to us in the form of bullets after the war commenced. Thousands of our boys were killed on the islands of the Pacific as a result of this foolish policy upon our part. Notwithstanding that disastrous experience, we are now doing the same thing only in a more aggravated form. It is being done on the theory that the channels of trade must be kept open if economic recovery is to be achieved in western Europe. In other words, it seems that we think more of the dollar gain than we do of the loss of the lives of our boys. There is no doubt in my mind that the lives of American boys in Korea have already been lost because of our foolishly permitting exporters from this country to send

strategic materials to western European countries to be sold on the open market, and thereby reach Russia or its satellite countries.

About 2 weeks ago Frank Edwards, radio commentator sponsored by the American Federation of Labor, made the startling revelation that a shipment of molybdenum, a highly important ingredient used in the process of hardening steel, has been shipped by an American exporter to England, and that after reaching that country it was transferred to a Russian ship destined for Russia.

As a result of this exposé a special committee of your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce started an investigation. We have conducted hearings and taken testimony. Witnesses have appeared from the Commerce Department, State Department, and ECA. We expect to have additional witnesses from the Department of Defense and then call witnesses from outside of the departments who can give information on the subject.

Although there has only been a limited number of hearings, yet it has been sufficient to demonstrate that great quantities of critical and strategic materials have gone out of this country to western European nations and that the same or similar materials have been shipped from those countries into Russia or its satellite nations. Furthermore, it has developed that there is extreme laxity in the operation of our control procedures, under the act which Congress passed which has made all this possible.

The policy of our State Department, Commerce Department, and ECA in this matter seems to be based upon the idea that we must keep the channels of trade open, and, that if the nations of western Europe are to be rehabilitated, then they must carry on trade relations with eastern Europe. Of course, no one doubts the benefits to be derived by trade, but it is a foolish policy when extended to critical and strategic materials and products that have a war potential. We are told that it is a delicate matter to object to other nations carrying on this type of trade, that they must be approached carefully and with due regard to their feelings, and that our departments of Government are working to that end. But the business is still going on, and our boys are dying in a cause that is fundamentally for the protection, not only of the Republic of South Korea, but of our allies in Europe as well as ourselves. While the diplomats are conferring, our boys are dying.

This whole idea, of stepping lightly for fear of treading on some sensitive toes, is difficult for me to understand or to justify. Our Nation is the backbone of the fight against communism and Russian aggression. We have spent, and are spending billions of dollars to strengthen the European nations against the aggressor. Why should we spend billions of dollars to protect them and give a sense of security to them if they are continuing to sell goods having a war potential that strengthens the military forces of the aggressors? It just does not make sense to me. It is time we began to be realistic.

This demand for a more realistic policy is not confined to this country. In England, Winston Churchill has called his government to account. Prime Minister Attlee justifies the business as usual policy, between his country and Russia, on the ground that they are fulfilling contracts previously made. Why not then depend upon Russia to protect them? Why do business with Russia and depend upon us to spend billions of dollars to provide them, and, other western European nations, with the necessary weapons of defense? Again, I say it does not make sense. It is time for a change of policy by us, by Great Britain and all the rest of the western European nations, who claim to be our allies. Let us be allies in a policy of security as well as recovery.

Some very interesting information has come to me through British news dispatches from London. From this source I learn that shipments from Great Britain to the Soviet Union, by the end of this year, will almost double the amount of goods shipped in 1938. In addition to the increased British-Russia trade, the Soviet Union has a big sterling balance which they are using to buy strategically important raw materials—rubber, tin, and wool—in Britain.

In 1938, Britain shipped goods valued at 6,462,000 pounds sterling. In the first 7 months of 1950, British exports amounted to 6,300,000 pounds sterling, and by January 1, this is expected to grow to a value between 11,000,000 and 12,000,000 pounds sterling.

British manufacturers of war potential materials who have contracts with Russia have requested the British Government to rescind export licenses so they can halt work on production for Russia and turn their lathes over to making war materials for the United Nations defense of Korea. Answering the British manufacturers, Prime Minister Attlee said his government would see to it that the trade with Russia did not weaken Britain's defenses. However, Attlee did not say that Britain would prevent her exports from strengthening the Russia economy and therefore the Red war potential.

J. R. Greenwood, chairman of a large British industrial firm which is making machine tools for the Soviet Union and who wants to cancel his contract, disagreed with Attlee that such exports did not adversely affect the nation's defenses. Greenwood argues:

Labor and raw materials are scarce, and deliveries to Russia are made at the expense of customers at home and friendly nations; the British Government's order of April 9, 1948, which the Prime Minister said closed the door on the export of goods of military value, contained loopholes permitting the shipment of tools of highly strategic value to Russia; it was plain lunacy to permit a potential enemy to see the extent of British resources.

Greenwood concluded:

Apparently we plan to continue to export our urgently required machine tools to the U. S. S. R. and get what we require from the United States.

From the Foreign Letter of the Whaley-Eaton Service, dated September 12, 1950, I learn that British public opinion is not convinced by Attlee's defense of shipments of military potentials to

Russia. The advantage seems to be all with the latter. The unfavorable trade balance for the United Kingdom was in millions of pounds, 30.5 in 1948, 13 in 1949, and is running at the rate of 33 so far this year. Russia has clearly been able to acquire large sterling balances. Her imports of rubber, which were only 9,000 tons in 1946, rose to 105,000 in 1949. In terms of generators, electric motors, earth-moving machines and machine tools, Russia has been taking 11 percent of Britain's total exports.

It is immaterial whether the electrical products shipped to Russia could have been used in Britain. The point is that the labor and materials employed on the Russian orders could have been used to increase domestic generating capacity, which is 25 percent below minimum needs.

This whole matter takes on more and more serious proportions the deeper one delves into it. For instance, a few days ago I was startled to read on the ticker tape of a wire service, the following:

FRANKFURT—The Americans clamped down harder today on the shipping of strategic supplies to iron-curtain countries by stopping 356 former United States Army trucks headed for Hungary.

Several carloads of unidentified materials also were held up at West Germany's eastern border, the American High Commission announced. The trucks were being delivered by a West German sales agency.

Three days ago the Americans stopped 30 rail carloads of machines and machine tools on their way to Russian-occupied east Germany and Communist-ruled countries of eastern Europe.

The Allied High Commission is reported to have directed the West German Government to plug up the loopholes through which such supplies are pouring.

Officials are said to have pointed out the foolishness of contributing to the war potential of possible eastern aggressors at a time when the defense and possible rearmament of West Germany is being considered as vitally necessary.

The trucks held up today were part of 1,000 the Hungarian Government ordered from the German agency which had bought them from Army surpluses.

I have in my possession the latest facts and figures as to kind of materials, quantities, and value entering trade between west and east Europe. These are from the reports and data submitted to our committee by the Departments of Government. They show an astounding situation that makes necessary either a change of policy upon our part or legislation that will correct the entire situation.

I am aware that it might not be the easiest thing to accomplish, but it is too important to the security of this Nation and our allies to permit further delay in providing a remedy.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wish the RECORD to show at this point that I have sought to get time to say something on this very important matter and have been refused time.

I want to clarify one thing. I have talked to the author of this Senate amendment, Senator WHERRY, within the last few hours, and all of this talk about his running out on his amendment is not the truth.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I do not yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has yielded to me, and I have the floor. The people of this country are getting pretty tired of this continual appeasement of Russia and Russian satellite countries. A lot of folks have not forgotten that at one time the people down at the other end of the avenue talked us out of a resolution to investigate the sale of scrap iron and oil to Japan. The people are not going to put up with any nonsense in connection with this very definite matter. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is just as good as nothing. What we should do is to vote down the previous question and adopt the substitute that will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I do not yield to anybody.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I hope you Members of Congress know that you have in this bill \$4,000,000,000 that you are going to give to foreign countries to arm them. That means \$25 for every man, woman, and child in America. A family of six it means \$150. Can you stand such enormous expenses on our people? You spend and you tax and you tax.

Now, suppose you give this money to arm these foreign countries. You have sent our marines over to Korea to fight a war. They are being killed each day; many and many of them. They die and their families suffer.

Why you give this money to arm? You only prepare for war in foreign countries. We have had enough war. Why do you not stop it? You are going too far in war—war does not help any one—everybody suffers. Then from the money that you give these foreign countries they take all the implements of war or things necessary to make implements of war and ship them into Russia, and some of these foreign countries will ship anything they can send to Russia in order to make a dollar. They send this material into Russia and the Russians use it against our marines and our soldiers. I tell you it is a crime against the American soldier. You send things to Russia to fight our own people. I say it is a shame and a crime.

Remember the reminder of the gentleman from Indiana who told us a few minutes ago how we shipped oil and scrap iron into Japan before World War II. You remember what happened; it will happen again if you do not stop fortifying others with our tax money. Oh! What a shame.

I am for the protection of America, the American soldier, the American people, and our form of government.

I saw an article here a while ago gotten up by the New Dealers in which

I was charged with being a hundred percent Red. Well, if I am a hundred percent Red I want you to know that I am an American and I am working for America. Whoever put that statement out was either drunk, pink, or yellow. You go tell that to the marines, the greatest fighting organization in the world.

It seems to me that with the taxes the American people are having to pay today in order to furnish the money to fight and supply the things that are necessary to keep our boys going over there, there should be a Wherry amendment to this bill. I cannot understand why you do not want such an amendment on the bill. I do not think this amendment is too strong; I do not think anything we can do to stop the use of American taxpayers' funds to supply materials of war behind the iron curtain is too strong. We must protect our soldiers and we must protect our civilization.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to say in response to the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana that Senator WHERRY in conference, in the presence of every manager on the part of the House and the Senate, wanted this amendment changed and said he depended on the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to make corrections in the House.

Mr. RICH. Why is it here? Why should we not have provisions in the bill to protect our American boys? Why is it not a good thing? Why is it we have so many Members here who want to help other countries? For God's sake, why do you not help America? Help the boys you send to the front to fight for America.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would not take the floor or impose myself upon you if I did not feel so very deeply about what might happen to us if the Senate amendment were agreed to. I do not know of anybody, certainly none who has spoken here today except the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who is not proposing some change in the Senate amendment.

The President of the United States, the head of the Army, and the Administrator of ECA, are all deeply disturbed about the Senate amendment. On yesterday morning Paul Hoffman came to see me—and I join the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] in the compliment he paid to Paul Hoffman; I doubt if we have a finer administrator of any act we have passed in the last several years than Paul Hoffman has been as the head of ECA. He was more deeply disturbed on yesterday when he came to my office than I have ever seen him or known him to be.

We do not have too many friends in the world. We need them as we never needed them before. In my opinion, we live in the most dangerous time that anyone has ever lived in during the history of our Republic. To say we are go-

ing to cut off now, probably without any rhyme or reason, trade and commerce of practically every kind and character would fall heavily upon those who have been friendly to us. We would be giving them up. Let me say that if it had not been for European aid I doubt if there is a country in Europe today that would not be under the arms of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment is a terrible mistake. Let me repeat that everybody in any position of responsibility in the Government of the United States feels the same way about it.

Let us modify this amendment, let us give somebody the authority and the discretion to do something about it, the authority to administer it in a sane, in a sound way, that will be safe for the people of the United States and safe for the people who are allied with us the world over.

So I trust that when the time comes and the gentleman from Missouri offers his motion to recede and concur with the amendment that has been read at the desk we will adopt that motion. Nobody could hate communism and all it stands for more than I do and I know that every Member of this House as a patriotic American feels the same way I do.

Let us not make a mistake, let us not give up the ground we have gained, let us not give up the friends that we so badly need in this terrible hour in the history of the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a right to propound a parliamentary inquiry to learn what the parliamentary situation is. There is no use of the Chair trying to run over the House in this way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is making a statement that is not justified by any facts—

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it is.

The SPEAKER. In the lifetime of the present occupant of the chair and the Chair deeply resents any such implication.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. I propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will quit talking in the wrong tone—

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Mississippi is going to stand his ground.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will permit him to propound his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. The motion now before the House is a motion to concur in the Senate amendment. As I understand it, the Cannon amendment is an amendment to that one. Do we not vote on that amendment before the previous question is ordered?

The SPEAKER. The parliamentary situation is this: The gentleman from Missouri offered a motion to recede and concur with an amendment. The gentleman from Mississippi offered a preferential motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The gentleman

from Missouri asked for a division of the question. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to recede. That is the parliamentary situation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANFIELD. Would it be in order to make a unanimous-consent request now that all three approaches to this problem be read to the House so that the House will be fully informed as to what is going on?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks we should vote on ordering the previous question first.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 120 with an amendment as follows:

"Sec. 1304. During any period in which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance shall be provided, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, or any other act to provide economic or financial assistance (other than military assistance) to foreign countries, to any country whose trade with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries, including Communist China and Communist North Korea) is found by the National Security Council to be contrary to the security interests of the United States."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. If the previous question is voted down, would it then be in order for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to offer an amendment to the pending amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York or any other Member would be in order in offering an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 112, noes 93.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 149, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

YEAS—167

Addonizio
Albert
Andrews
Aspinall

Bailey
Barden
Baring
Barrett, Pa.

Battle
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen

Biemiller
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bonner
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Burdick
Burke
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Cavalcante
Chatham
Chesney
Clemente
Combs
Cooper
Cox
Crook
Crosier
Davenport
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Donohue
Doughton
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gore

Gorski
Gossett
Granahan
Grant
Green
Hardy
Harris
Hart
Hays, Ark.
Hedrick
Heffernan
Herlong
Hobbs
Howell
Huber
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karst
Karsten
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Kruise
Lane
Lanham
Lind
Linehan
Lucas
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan, S. C.
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marshall
Miles
Mills
Mitchell
Monrone

NAYS—149

Abbitt
Abernethy
Allen, Calif.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andersen,
August H.
Arends
Auchincloss
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Bramblett
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Case, N. J.
Chipperfield
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Corbett
Cotton
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Elston
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Ford
Gamble
Gavin
Golden
Goodwin
Graham
Gross
Gull

Hagen
Hale
Hall,
Leonard W.
Halleck
Harden
Hare
Harrison
Harvey
Hays, Ohio
Herter
Heseltan
Hoeben
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
James
Jenison
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kilburn
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lichtenwalter
Lover
McConnell
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
Macy
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Morrow
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Morton
Murray, Wis.
Nelson
Norblad

Morgan
Morris
Murdock
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Peterson
Preston
Price
Rabaut
Ramsay
Regan
Rhodes
Richards
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sheppard
Sikes
Sims
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauriello
Teague
Thomas
Thompson
Trimble
Vinson
Walsh
Walter
Welch
Whitaker
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wier
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.

NOT VOTING—113

Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Anderson, Calif.
Angell
Barrett, Wyo.
Bates, Ky.
Bosone
Boykin
Breen
Brehm
Buckley, N. Y.
Burnside
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Chelf
Christopher
Chudoff
Cooley
Coudert
Davies, N. Y.
Dingell
Dollinger
Douglas
Doyle
Eaton
Ellsworth
Engel, Mich.
Fernandez
Fisher
Fulton
Furcolo
Gillette
Gilmer
Gordon
Granger
Gregory
Gwinn
Hall,
Edwin Arthur O'Konski

So the previous question was ordered.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Tackett for, with Mr. Brehm against.
Mr. Murphy for, with Mr. Nicholson against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Withrow against.
Mr. Havenner for, with Mr. Hand against.
Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.
Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Case of South Dakota against.
Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Gwinn against.
Mr. Dollinger for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.
Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.
Mr. Kerr for, with Mr. Potter against.
Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Fulton against.
Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Woodruff against.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky for, with Mr. Jonas against.
Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.
Mr. Underwood for, with Mr. Gillette against.
Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Meyer against.
Mr. Breen for, with Mr. Plumley against.
Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Sadlak against.
Mr. Noland for, with Mr. Nixon against.
Mr. Granger for, with Mr. Poulson against.
Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. McMillen of Illinois against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Hinshaw against.
Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Werdel against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Kunkel against.
Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Engel of Michigan against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Redden with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Hill.
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
Mr. Burnside with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Mack of Washington.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Wm. L. Pfeiffer.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 286, nays 30, answered "present" 1, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

YEAS—286

Abbitt
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andersen,
August H.
Andrews
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Barden
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Biemiller
Bishop
Blackney
Blatnik
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Ohio
Bonner
Boykin
Bramblett
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Burdick
Burke
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Cavalcante
Chatham
Chesney
Chipperfield
Clemente
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Corbett
Cotton
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Crook
Crosier
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davenport
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Eberharter
Elliott
Elston
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Feighan
Fenton
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Frazier
Fugate
Furcolo
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Golden
Goodwin
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Graham
Granahan
Grant
Green
Gross
Gull
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall,
Leonard W.
Harden
Hardy
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Herlong
Herter
Heseltan
Hobbs
Hoeben
Holmes
Hope
Howell
Huber
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jacobs
James
Jenkins
Jensen
Johnson
Jones, Ala.

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Price | Scudder | Thompson |
| Priest | Shafer | Tollefson |
| Rabaut | Sheppard | Trimble |
| Ramsay | Short | Veide |
| Rees | Sikes | Vinson |
| Regan | Simpson, Ill. | Wagner |
| Richards | Sims | Walsh |
| Riehlman | Smathers | Waiter |
| Rivers | Smith, Kans. | Weichel |
| Robeson | Smith, Va. | Weich |
| Rodino | Spence | Whitaker |
| Rogers, Fla. | Staggers | Whitten |
| Rogers, Mass. | Stanley | Whittington |
| Rooney | Steed | Wickersham |
| Roosevelt | Stefan | Widnall |
| St. George | Stockman | Wier |
| Sanborn | Sullivan | Wigglesworth |
| Sasscer | Sutton | Wilson, Ind. |
| Saylor | Talle | Wilson, Okla. |
| Scott, Hardie | Tauriello | Wilson, Tex. |
| Scott, | Taylor | Wolcott |
| Hugh D., Jr. | Teague | Wolverton |
| Scrivner | Thomas | |

NAYS—30

| | | |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| Abernethy | Horan | Rich |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hull | Secrest |
| Bolton, Md. | Jenison | Simpson, Pa. |
| Clevenger | Jennings | Smith, Wis. |
| Crawford | Mason | Taber |
| Davis, Ga. | Miller, Md. | Towe |
| Fallon | Pace | Wheeler |
| Fellows | Pickett | White, Calif. |
| Halleck | Rankin | Williams |
| Hoffman, Mich. | Reed, N. Y. | Winstead |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—112

| | | |
|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Allen, Ill. | Heller | Pfeiffer, |
| Allen, La. | Hill | William L. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Hinshaw | Philbin |
| Angell | Hoffman, Ill. | Plumley |
| Bailey | Hollifield | Poage |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Javits | Potter |
| Bates, Ky. | Jonas | Poulson |
| Bosone | Keefe | Powell |
| Breen | Keogh | Quinn |
| Brehm | Kerr | Rains |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Klein | Redden |
| Burnside | Kunkel | Reed, Ill. |
| Case, S. Dak. | Larcade | Rhodes |
| Celler | Lodge | Ribicoff |
| Chelf | Lyle | Sabath |
| Christopher | Lynch | Sadlak |
| Chudoff | McCarthy | Sadowski |
| Cooley | McCormack | Shelley |
| Coudert | McMillen, Ill. | Smith, Ohio |
| Davis, N. Y. | Mack, Wash. | Stigler |
| Dingell | Magee | Tackett |
| Dollinger | Martin, Iowa | Thornberry |
| Doyle | Meyer | Underwood |
| Durham | Miller, Calif. | Van Zandt |
| Eaton | Morrison | Vorys |
| Ellsworth | Moulder | Vursell |
| Engel, Mich. | Multer | Wadsworth |
| Fernandez | Murphy | Werdel |
| Fulton | Murray, Tenn. | White, Idaho |
| Gillette | Nicholson | Willis |
| Gilmer | Nixon | Withrow |
| Gordon | Noland | Wood |
| Granger | Norton | Woodhouse |
| Gregory | O'Brien, Mich. | Woodruff |
| Hall, | O'Konski | Yates |
| Edwin Arthur | Patten | Young |
| Hand | Perkins | Zablocki |
| Havener | Pfeiffer, | |
| Hébert | Joseph L. | |

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
 Mr. Gregory with Mr. Woodruff.
 Mr. Underwood with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Kerr with Mr. Van Zandt.
 Mr. Patten with Mr. Meyer.
 Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Brehm.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Angell.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Coudert.
 Mr. Tackett with Mr. Withrow.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Anderson of California.
 Mr. Rains with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
 Mr. Redden with Mr. Potter.
 Mr. Granger with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
 Mr. Gordon with Mr. Sadlak.
 Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Vorys.

XCVI—971

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Vursell.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Fulton.
 Mr. Young with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. Larcade with Mr. Mack of Washington.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
 Mr. Moulder with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
 Mr. Perkins with Mr. Werdel.
 Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Jonas.
 Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Hand.
 Mr. Breen with Mr. Gillette.
 Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Nicholson.
 Mr. Burnside with Mr. Nixon.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. Poulson.
 Mr. Havener with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Hinshaw.
 Mr. McCormack with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
 Mr. Stigler with Mr. Hill.
 Mr. Rhodes with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
 Mr. Magee with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
 Mr. Doyle with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. MARCANTONIO changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

MESSRS. HALE, ARENDS, GUILL, BROWN of Ohio, JENKINS, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, CURTIS, BEALL, BRYSON, and SHAFER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RICH asked and was granted permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE NEED FOR UNITY

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that it is almost useless to ask for unity of purpose this near a general election. Yet that is exactly what I am going to ask. I am asking my colleagues—and all Americans everywhere—to close ranks and face our Nation's perils with calm courage, determination, and singleness of purpose.

In the days that lie ahead we will have to spend many more billions of dollars for building up our military might. Many men will have to go into the armed services and we here at home will have to pay more taxes and buy fewer civilian goods. We will have to do this to inspire respect—and, if necessary, fear—in those who must be held in check if America and the world are ever to enjoy freedom, security, and peace. In accepting these sacrifices and inconveniences, I think it is important that we remember what makes them necessary.

In an election year, it is natural that some people should try to place all the blame on the Democratic Party, and others should try to place all the blame on the Republican Party. No doubt men of both parties have made mistakes, but neither is to blame for our present difficulties. The blame rests squarely with Communist Russia, and the insane ambition of the men in the Kremlin to dominate the world.

Russian policies are based on the doctrine that she will never be completely secure until communism is spread throughout the world, with "Mother Russia" as the dominant nation. All of her actions since the end of World War II have clearly been pointed toward that objective. Where she could annex more territory, she has done so. Where she could send her armies, she has installed totalitarian government slavishly subservient to Moscow. Where there has been poverty and discontent, she has tried to foment civil war and discord. Where none of these techniques have been effective, she has used propaganda, international bad faith, espionage, and sabotage to try to weaken the nations that still have the strength and courage to resist.

Against this ruthless, unprincipled foe, we will have to concentrate all our moral and physical resources—or perish as a free nation.

That is why I am pleading with all Americans to unite in our struggle against this common enemy. That does not mean that we must refrain from criticizing those in power. There is always room for honest criticism. But it does mean that we should always keep uppermost in our minds the most important objective—survival of the United States of America as an independent, prosperous nation of free individuals.

If we keep that objective in mind, there will still be room for plenty of honest criticism and for unlimited free discussion of political issues in the democratic tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues and all Americans to put first things first, second things second, and third things third.

First. Our deadly struggle against world communism.

Second. Criticism of mistakes, inefficiencies, and injustices in our Government.

Third. Personal political advantage.

To keep this order of things clearly in mind in public affairs will require restraint from all of us, for it is always a great temptation to put self-interest before the interest of the country as a whole. But we must resist that temptation, for the more moderation and self-discipline we exhibit, the more chance we have of surviving in the face of the world-conquering ambitions of the madmen of the Kremlin.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

ADMINISTRATION OF PERFORMANCE-RATING PLANS FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7824) to provide for the

administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

PARCEL POST RATES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, amendment 33 to H. R. 9526, as written into this legislation by the House and concurred in by the other body, is an excellent amendment in that before funds appropriated to the Post Office Department may be withdrawn from the general funds of the Treasury the Postmaster General shall certify in writing that he has requested the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the establishment of such rates as will result in parcel-post revenues equaling the expenditures for handling that class of mail matter.

This action has been required by law for approximately 36 years, but the Post Office Department has failed to carry out its responsibilities. Since 1946 the Post Office Department has been faced with mounting deficits. Members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and other Members of Congress have constantly reminded the Postmaster General of his responsibility to initiate administrative action to increase parcel-post rates. This is the first effective action that the Congress is taking to enforce the law.

This provision was included in H. R. 9526 as it passed the House, and I know that even as late as when this bill was being considered by the Senate Appropriation Committee the Postmaster General asked that the language be deleted, although at the same time he admitted that the law at the present time directs the Postmaster General to take the action which this provision of the Appropriation Act will require.

With the mounting postal deficit Congress has been faced with the problem of raising postal rates. On January 1, 1949, postal-rate increases amounting to \$150,000,000 were placed into effect. This year the House passed a postal-rate-increase bill of an equal amount. Previous to these rate increases there have been no rate-increase bills that anywhere near approach them either in amount of increase or complexity of rate structure.

In the Eightieth Congress a study was made of the postal-rate structure. A bill which I introduced was recommended favorably by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This bill would have required more realistic recommendations from the Post Office Department with regard to postal-rate structures, and the task force on the Hoover Commission adopted the suggestions of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in their recommendations.

Postal-rate bill, H. R. 2945, provides that the Postmaster General establish the rates on the special services. This bill is still awaiting action in the other

body. I trust that if this provision is put into effect the Postmaster General will approach his responsibility thereunder more affirmatively than he has his responsibilities to take action on parcel-post rate increases.

Under the provisions of Public Law 231, a far-reaching research and development program was established in the postal service. Part of this program is the establishment of a division to study postal rates and make recommendations to the Congress. It is rather revealing to learn that the Post Office Department has been making rate recommendations covering a rate structure collecting revenues of over a billion and a half dollars a year without any permanent unit to study these rates and their relationship to the users of the mails.

I believe that far-reaching steps have been taken in solving the postal rate problem, but they can be no more effective than the administration charged with the responsibility of carrying them out.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the gentlewoman from New York is entitled to much credit for the work she has done on the problem of postal rate-making procedures, both in the Eightieth Congress and the present Congress.

One has but to read the Hoover Commission recommendations on postal rate revision and the recommendations of the task force to realize that she has presented the solutions and the logic from which are developing constructive changes in our postal rate-making procedures.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE REST OF THE DAY

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the acting majority leader what the program will be for the rest of the day.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, there are two minor conference reports in which there is unanimous agreement from the Committee on Public Lands. There are one or two resolutions from the Committee on House Administration which I understand are pretty well agreed to. Following consideration of these matters we propose to take up the bill H. R. 9219 scheduled for consideration earlier in the week. That is for the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes. There is a rule on it calling for 1 hour of general debate. I believe that is all for the remainder of the afternoon. I might say to the minority leader that consent has already been obtained to convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman heard of what action the President will take upon the so-called security bill?

Mr. PRIEST. No; the gentleman has not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish he would convey to the President

our hopes he can make a decision early tomorrow.

Mr. PRIEST. I feel certain that the President will make up his mind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

HON. JOHN JENNINGS AND HON. SAM HOBBS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, only the experienced know how intimate is the relationship between members of a hard-working congressional committee. It is in the committee room that a Member demonstrates the stuff that is in him. If he is industrious, capable, courteous, and tolerant, he is sure to have the respect, confidence, and affection of his colleagues.

I have served on the Committee on the Judiciary for many years with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], who are retiring at the end of this session. Both meet the specifications I have just mentioned.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] has the longer service in the Congress and on the committee. When the Democrats were in power, he was my subcommittee chairman and, when the Republicans were in power—a very short time in recent years—I was his chairman. We never had any politics on our subcommittee, and I am sure under Judge HOBBS' leadership the committee has accomplished much good, and that this is a better country because of some of the legislation sponsored and placed on the statute books through Judge HOBBS' effort. He is one of the best lawyers in the Congress. He is legally and fundamentally sound and, with this background, plus extensive practical experience as an advocate and as a judge, it is perfectly natural that he should be a legal leader in the House. Debate in the House on any profound legal question is not completed until Judge HOBBS has spoken. The rank and file of the membership usually await his arguments before reaching a final conclusion. This is as high a compliment as I could pay any member of the committee.

Judge HOBBS is retiring voluntarily because of ill health, and it is the hope of the entire membership of the House that less arduous work, more time to play, and Selma, Ala., sunshine will do the job, and that in the not too far distant future Judge HOBBS will regain his former vigor and be available for some public service for which he is so adequately and particularly qualified. Few, if any, men will be missed more when the Eighty-second Congress convenes. We all wish for SAM HOBBS every good thing in life.

There has been real grief in the House since the announcement that Judge JENNINGS, of Tennessee, is to retire. The judge occupies a unique position in our midst. Another great jurist, and I am sure a great advocate and trial lawyer, as

well as one of the most effective, logical, and entertaining debaters in Congress, his profound logic is always garnished with apropos wit and humor. In other words, he knows how to make his point, and then he is blessed with the ability to present his proposition in a way that the listeners cannot forget.

As chairman and as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary, he has been the watchdog of the Treasury and has by his tireless work, close attention, and great legal ability saved millions of dollars for the taxpayers of the Nation.

I understand the judge is going to return to Tennessee and reenter the practice of the law. We all know he will succeed in that field, and his many warm friends—and that includes all of us—in the Congress are hoping he will later return to the work for which he is so eminently fitted and which he has so satisfactorily accomplished. Judge, we will be thinking of you down in your native Tennessee, and it will not take much imagination to envision you with your saddle horse, your hound dogs, and your fishing tackle. Whatever path you choose, here is hoping that it leads to pleasant places.

PALISADES DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2195) to authorize the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, to authorize the north side pumping division and related works, to provide for the disposition of reserved space in American Falls Reservoir, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 3121)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2195) to authorize the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, to authorize the north side pumping division and related works, to provide for the disposition of reserved space in American Falls Reservoir, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, Idaho, heretofore authorized under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws by the presentation to the President and the Congress of the report of December 9, 1941 (House Document Numbered 457, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session), by the Secretary of the Interior (herein called the Secretary), is hereby reauthorized under the Federal reclamation laws for construction and operation and maintenance substantially in accordance with that report

as supplemented and modified by the Commissioner's supplemental report and the recommendations incorporated by reference therein, as approved and adopted by the Secretary on July 1, 1949, and as including, upon approval by the President of a suitable plan therefor, facilities for the improvement of fish and wildlife along the headwaters of the Snake River, such facilities to be administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding recommendations to the contrary contained in said report (a) the Secretary shall reserve not to exceed fifty-five thousand acre-feet of active capacity in Palisades Reservoir for a period ending December 31, 1952, for replacement of Grays Lake storage, but no facilities in connection with the proposed wildlife management area at Grays Lake shall be built and no allocation of construction costs of the Palisades Dam and Reservoir by reason of providing replacement storage to that area shall be made until the development and operation and maintenance of the wildlife management area has been authorized by Act of Congress, and (b) the nonreimbursable allocation on account of recreation shall be limited to the costs of specific recreation facilities in an amount not to exceed \$148,000.

"Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized for construction and operation and maintenance under the Federal reclamation laws: (a) the north side pumping division of the Minidoka project, this to be substantially in accordance with the Commissioner's report and the recommendations incorporated by reference therein, as approved and adopted by the Secretary on July 1, 1949: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding recommendations to the contrary contained in said report, (1) lease or sale of that portion of the power service system extending from the substations to the pumping plants may be made to any entity on terms and conditions that will permit the United States to continue to provide power and energy to the pumping facilities of the division, and, in the event of lease or sale to a body not entitled to preference in the purchase of power under the Federal reclamation laws, will preserve a reasonable opportunity for subsequent lease or sale to a body that is entitled to such privilege, (2) no allocation of construction costs of the division shall be made on a nonreimbursable basis by reason of wildlife benefits, and (3) there shall be, in lieu of a forty-year period, a basic repayment period of fifty years for repayment, in the manner provided in the recommendations, of the irrigation costs assigned for repayment by the water users; and (b) for the furnishing of electric power for irrigation pumping to that division and for other purposes, power generating and related facilities at American Falls Dam. These generating and related facilities, to the extent the Secretary finds to be proper for pay-out and rate-making purposes, may be accounted for together with other power facilities operated by the Secretary that are interconnected with the American Falls Dam power facilities, excluding any power facilities the net profits of which are governed by subsection 1 of section 4 of the Act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 703). The authorizations set forth in the preceding sections 1 and 2 shall not extend to the construction of transmission lines, subsections, or distribution lines unless such facilities are for the purposes of interconnecting the power plants herein authorized, or for the delivery of power and energy for use in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the projects herein authorized.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized to contract, under the Federal reclamation laws, with water users and water users' organizations as to the use for their benefit of the heretofore reserved storage capacity in American Falls Reservoir. Not to exceed three hundred and fifteen thousand acre-feet

of that capacity shall be made available to those who have heretofore had the use of reserved capacity under lease arrangements between the United States and the American Falls Reservoir district of Idaho, the distribution of this capacity among contractors to be determined by the Secretary after consultation with the interested water users' organizations or their representatives. Of the balance of the reserved capacity, forty-seven thousand five hundred and ninety-three acre-feet are hereby set aside for use under contract for the benefit of the lands comprising unit A of the north side pumping division of the Minidoka project, and seventy-one thousand acre-feet are hereby set aside for use under contract for the benefit of those lands in the Michaud area which may hereafter be found to be feasible of development under irrigation. Contracts for the repayment of construction charges in connection with reserved capacity shall be made without regard to the second proviso of the tenth paragraph (Minidoka project, Idaho) under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation" of the Act of June 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 390, 417). Such contracts shall require the repayment of all costs determined by the Secretary to be allocable to the reserved capacity, less, in the case of the three hundred and fifteen thousand acre-feet of capacity above described, three hundred and eighty-six four-hundred-and-thirty-fourths of the revenues realized, after deduction of what the Secretary determines to be an appropriate share for operation, maintenance, and replacements, from the leasing of that capacity for irrigation purposes up to the time water first becomes available in Palisades Reservoir and, in the case of the capacity set aside for the north side pumping division, all other revenues realized from or connected with the reserved capacity and which the Secretary determines to be available as a credit against the cost allocable to that division.

"Sec. 4. (a) The continuation of construction of Palisades Dam beyond December 31, 1951, or such later controlling date fixed by the Secretary as herein provided, is hereby made contingent on there being a finding by the Secretary by the controlling date that contracts have been entered with various water users' organizations of the Upper Snake River Valley in Idaho that, in his opinion, will provide for an average annual savings of one hundred and thirty-five thousand acre-feet of winter water. If in the Secretary's judgment the failure of the requisite organizations so to contract by the controlling date at any time is for reasons beyond the control of those organizations, he may set a new controlling date but not beyond December 31, 1952.

"(b) Repayment contracts made in connection with the use of capacity in either American Falls or Palisades Reservoir may include, among other things, such provisions as the Secretary determines to be proper to give effect to recommendations referred to in section 1 of this Act, and particularly those concerning the continued effectiveness of the arrangements as to the minimum average annual water savings.

"Sec. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sums of not to exceed \$76,601,000 for the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, Idaho, \$11,395,000 for the Minidoka project north side pumping division, Idaho, and \$6,600,000 for the American Falls power plant."

And the Senate agree to same.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
JOHN SANBORN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
GUY CORDON,
ZALES N. ECTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2195), to authorize the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, to authorize the north side pumping division and related works, to provide for the disposition of reserved space in American Falls Reservoir, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

S. 2195 as amended in conference sets forth in the last sentence of section 2 that transmission lines, substations, or distribution lines can only be constructed under the provisions of this act if such facilities are for the delivery of power and energy for use in connection with construction, operation, and maintenance of the projects herein authorized, thereby limiting such construction to the projects themselves. It is believed that this was the intent of the Senate wording and the conferees merely wish to clarify the provision.

Old section 5 of the House amendment has been deleted for the reason that it is not deemed advisable to make this act a portion of the Federal reclamation law.

Section 5 of the conferees' amendment retains the original authorization for an appropriation of not to exceed \$76,801,000. The difference of \$350,000 in the Senate amendment from the House amendment was occasioned by a misunderstanding as to an item for wildlife management which was nonreimbursable and not included in the original estimate, and therefore should not be deducted.

All other provisions of the Senate and House measures are the same.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
JOHN SANBORN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIANS—SETTLEMENT OF CONTRACTS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 5372.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWAS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6319) authorizing a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 3113)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6319) to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from the fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States arising from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber within the Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota, according to the provisions of the Act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to the credit of the Red Lake Indians in Minnesota, and to pay therefrom \$75, in two equal installments to each member of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota who is living at the date of enactment of this Act. The first installment of \$37.50 per capita to be made upon the passage and approval of this Act and the second installment of \$37.50 per capita to be made January 15, 1951. Such installment payments shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

"Sec. 2. No money paid to Indians under this Act shall be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other persons. Before any payment is made under this Act, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota shall, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, ratify and accept the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 3. Payments made under this Act shall not be held to be 'other income and resources' as that term is used in sections 2 (a) (7), 402 (a) (7), and 1002 (a) (8) of the Social Security Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 42, secs. 302 (a) (7), 602 (a) (7), and 1202 (a) (8))."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,

TOBY MORRIS,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,

HUGH BUTLER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 6319) to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The effect of such conference was that the original bill, as passed by the House, was adopted except that the \$100 payment, as authorized by the House and amended to \$75 by the Senate, was reduced to \$75 to be paid in two equal installments in amounts of \$37.50. Thus the bill agreed to in con-

ference is the same as originally passed the House except the per capita payment of \$100 was reduced to that of \$75, and in turn each \$50 payment reduced proportionately to \$37.50.

In conformity with such action, the title was amended.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,

TOBY MORRIS,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 843 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9219) to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 9219 is to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma.

In going over the report, I think you will find that the Indians have been one of our best borrowers. In other words, their percentage of repayment has been very high. I do not know the attitude of each Member of this great House on this subject, but I feel the finest thing we can do for an Indian is to let him be self-supporting and let him feel that he is not receiving the bounty of America but is being allowed to participate in America's economic development. That is what this bill makes possible. He can borrow money from the Government. Of course, it is a revolving fund, which he will pay back. I think this is one step forward toward making Indians truly a part of America's economic program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY] has stated, House Resolution 843 makes in order with 1 hour of general debate the bill H. R. 9219, which would provide for the expenditure of about \$10,000,000 to promote the rehabilitation

of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma.

I have not been fully informed on details of this legislation. I understand there has been some controversy over it. While some of the Members believe this is an exceptionally good bill, others are opposed to it or believe it should be amended so as to give the country back to the Indians, in view of the present situation. However, I believe the House should adopt this rule and consider this bill in order to clear its legislative schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is a very dangerous bill. There have been passed bills of similar character for Indians in other places, but in those bills it has been required that there be a guaranty from the Indians of repayment of the funds advanced. Here they have refused to do anything of the kind. Here we are letting out all the rich Indians in Oklahoma. There are a lot of them who have gotten rich out of oil that has been found on their lands. We are not asking them to guarantee the repayment of the loans it is proposed in the bill that the Government advance to try to rehabilitate the rest of them.

Why we should play favorites and why we should do such things as that and approach the proposition on that basis is beyond my understanding. I doubt very much the desirability of bills of this kind, anyway, because if there is going to be any approach to this problem on a constructive basis it should be on the basis of all of them being treated alike in an omnibus bill that would cover the whole thing. We have had piecemeal legislation. The legislation has not only been piecemeal but it has been subject to favoritism.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. The gentleman has an intimate knowledge of the loans that the United States Government has made to the Indians. Is not the record of the Indians rather good so far as the percentage of returns to the Government on money borrowed? That is what I gather from the hearings.

Mr. TABER. I do not have too much knowledge of that. On the other hand, I do not believe that we should make fish of one group and fowl of another. That is what this bill does. It plays favorites. I am surprised that the committee brought it in in this shape. I think it is entirely wrong to approach anything like this in this way.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I am not acquainted with the former Indian loan bills passed by the House. Did they demand guaranties?

Mr. TABER. The legislation with reference to the Montana Indians required that the Indians guarantee a payment of these loans. Here we have an outstanding group of rich Indians in Oklahoma who are being given a favor as against the Indians in Montana.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Are these Indians for whom it is said this bill is to be a benefit free to seek employment and work anywhere in the United States?

Mr. TABER. I do not know of any reason why they cannot. I do not know of anyone who would keep them from it. According to what I understand, a large percentage of these Indians are able to earn a living and take care of themselves. There are a few, a small percentage of about 8 or 10 percent, who are in a very low income bracket. Most of them are in a much better condition. It would seem to me that all these rich Indians who have had the benefit of selling the oil on their lands and getting royalties ought to be obliged to guarantee the payment of these loans. It seems to me outlandish that we should let the Montana Indians pay back the money and guarantee to pay it back, then play favorites with the other people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I agree entirely with what the gentleman is saying. It seems to me we should treat all the Indians in the same way. I note under section 3 that loans are to be made and that under section 4, as I read it, 20 percent of the sum appropriated could be used for other than loans. Is it the gentleman's point that under the part which is to be used for loans there should be some guaranty on the part of the people other than the ones who are getting the loans?

Mr. TABER. I think that where these loans are made in this way the members of the tribe should guarantee it.

Mr. KEATING. That is, that the wealthy members of this tribe should be the people primarily responsible to see that this money is returned to the Government?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. Do I understand correctly, and I would be glad if either the gentleman or one of the members of the committee would explain this, that section 4 provides 20 percent of the sum appropriated here may be parceled out as grants without any provision for reimbursement? If that is a correct interpretation of it, was that provided in previous legislation heretofore enacted with reference to the Indians?

Mr. TABER. I would not be able to answer that.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DEWART. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has asked two questions. First, in regard to the guaranty. It is not a question of individual Indians guaranteeing these loans in any of these bills. It is a question of the tribe, where the tribe has an estate, guaranteeing the loans. Some of the tribes have large estates. We have one in California, the Agua Caliente, which has an estate of about \$15,000,000. In cases where those tribes have wealthy estates, we felt that they should at least

guarantee a part of the loan, if not all of it.

Mr. KEATING. And that applies to the Montana Indians?

Mr. DEWART. In certain instances that applies to the Montana Indians.

Mr. KEATING. Is the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] correct in his statement that the deal for the Montana Indians was not nearly as favorable as this deal which is now being made with the Oklahoma Indians?

Mr. DEWART. That is true; and I have some correspondence to that effect.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman know, as a member of the committee, of any reason why we should make a different deal for the two tribes?

Mr. DEWART. It was brought out in the hearings on the bill H. R. 9219 that these Indians in Oklahoma are not organized as tribes, with tribal estates, as the Indians in Montana.

Mr. KEATING. Could the gentleman answer my inquiry regarding section 4, whether it is a fact that 20 percent of the sum appropriated is to be parceled out as grants rather than as loans?

Mr. DEWART. That is correct. The 20 percent varies in different bills, but in this bill it is 20 percent. The purpose is to make a grant to these Indians, the thought behind it being that these loans will be made to totally destitute Indians for the rehabilitation of those people. If you would make it all loan, you would put them in a position where you could get none of it back. We follow this practice in the case of farm security loans, where there is total destitution and you want to rehabilitate a worthy person. You must give them some start in the hope of getting the rest of it back. That is the thought behind this 20 percent.

Mr. KEATING. In that respect, is it the same as or different from the arrangement made with reference to the Montana Indians?

Mr. DEWART. I am not sure that the percentage is the same, but in all the bills there is the grant provision, none of them exceeding 20 percent.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that in the regular Interior Department appropriation bill for Indians there is some money provided for the relief of these Five Civilized Tribes, as well as the rest of the Indians?

Mr. DEWART. That is right. There is also a revolving fund that amounts, with the present appropriation, to a total of some \$12,000,000. It has been around five to seven million dollars. However, that total amount is not adequate to do the job that we need to do. Somebody raised the question a short time ago as to the repayment of these loans. If you will turn to page 5 of the report, you will find that the repayment of these loans made under this revolving fund has been quite good. In fact, it has been excellent, as a whole.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am happy to say that the record of the Indians in paying off their indebtedness to the Government has been very good, but I cannot quite understand why you bring in a bill at this time for the relief of Indians, where you will take 20 percent of this \$10,000,000 which the bill provides that can be spent for relief; that is, pure grant, when, after all, we had a hearing at the time the Indian Service came before the subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation bill and we took these matters up. We thought we were providing enough. We were very liberal in granting relief to the needy Indians. Now, to bring in this particular bill for a specific group of Indians, I am afraid would not go well with the rest of the Indians.

Mr. D'EWART. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that the precedent for this bill will be found in the Navajo legislation, wherein we set up a \$80,000,000 authorization for a fund to rehabilitate the Navajo Indian Reservation.

We do this because we recognize that we have a peculiar situation which needs special treatment and which must be properly handled if we are ever to rehabilitate those Indians.

Mr. JENSEN. I recognize what was done for the Navajos.

Mr. D'EWART. On that precedent other tribes have come to our committee and asked that they have similar treatment because they, too, said they had peculiar conditions that needed a special loan and revolving fund.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; and I am sure the gentleman will remember that conditions on the Navajo reservation are so much worse than on any other reservation that they should not be used for comparison at all.

Mr. D'EWART. I know the situation is very, very bad there.

Mr. JENSEN. But in the case of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, as the gentleman from New York has explained, they are, generally speaking, in pretty good financial condition. There is a certain percentage which your report shows need relief, and that relief is being given to them, I think, to the degree that all the rest of the Indians of the Nation are getting relief in the regular appropriation bill. If the Indian Service would administer the funds we appropriate in the regular appropriation bill in a manner which is equitable and just to all Indians, there would be sufficient relief.

I think this is dangerous business, to come in here at this late hour and request relief funds for a particular tribe of Indians, especially Indians who have been getting along pretty well, comparatively speaking.

Mr. D'EWART. Let me say that the ranking Republican member on the Interior Appropriation Subcommittee, and also the whole committee, were very generous in their appropriations. The appropriation to the Indian Bureau this year was the largest in history.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. D'EWART. I do not say that more funds could not be used to the advantage of the rehabilitation of certain tribes; I think that is true; but the appropriations this year were very good.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. I had something to do with that; and I am pleased to say that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], had a great deal to do with it, because he is a doctor and he was especially interested in the problem of health. He has done great work on that committee and seen to it that the Indians had proper care as far as health and education were concerned, and so on.

Now I should like to ask the gentleman this question: Here we have the balance of this bill, or approximately 80 percent of it, which would be \$8,000,000 for loans. I think the record of the Indian service, as far as loans to needy Indians are concerned, has not been so good in a lot of instances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York two additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman from New York will let me proceed a little further: If the gentleman will remember, in the last session of the Eightieth Congress we appropriated \$150,000 to be lent to the Navajo Indians to buy milk animals because old Collier had taken the milk goats away from the Indians and made them buy sheep. Then the Grazing Service told them they were overgrazing and made them sell half of their sheep. We were then asked to lend that money to the Indians who needed a milk goat or two.

I understand there has not been a single loan made up to date for that purpose, so I am wondering if this \$8,000,000 is going to be treated in that manner.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Where do you get the eight?

Mr. JENSEN. Eighty percent of \$10,000,000 is \$8,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman going to vote against the bill?

Mr. JENSEN. I think this bill has been hastily considered and it should go back for more consideration before the House passes on it.

Mr. D'EWART. Nobody knows better than the gentleman from Iowa that in connection with several of these tribes throughout the country we have a difficult situation and only by giving those Indians a chance to rehabilitate themselves are we ever going to help them so that they will become self-supporting independent citizens. It is going to take special treatment. We have got to face that fact if we are going to make them self-supporting citizens of the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York for his explanation of this matter.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the hearings in regard to this

bill and if you will examine them you will see that this bill was not hastily considered. We gave it the most careful and earnest consideration.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a serious error here; in fact, I know there is a serious error, although I am sure it is a good-faith error, in indicating that we have played favoritism. Why, I could ask a number of you to stand up over there on that side who have come to our committee and we have been happy to help you with your bills.

The truth of the matter is that four bills similar to this one have been passed for Members on the minority side and their States, two for our late beloved friend from North Dakota [Mr. Lemke] and two for the distinguished and outstanding Member of this House, our good friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART]. Those bills are similar, they are all of the same pattern. Of course, there must be some detailed differences because of the different circumstances involved, but you will find that in regard to the loans to these Indians, whether those loans were secured by tribal funds or property or not, the record in regard to those loans is far ahead of the record of many white people of America. These Indians have made an outstanding record in this Nation in the returns that these good people have made on the loans which have been made to them.

I just call your attention to this fact that it would be tragic, in my judgment, for us to turn this bill down. Since you have raised the question of partisanship—I would not have raised it—but certainly you good friends over there are not going to maintain a partisanship issue at this time since the record will show that we passed four bills for gentlemen on your side.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want the gentleman to leave politics out of it.

Mr. MORRIS. I will yield in just a moment after I finish my statement. I say, it would be tragic, gentleman, if we should become involved in a partisan issue, and I certainly do not want the bill to be involved in a partisan issue, because our committee does not feel that way. There is no partisanship on our committee. We did not pass four bills just because they were Republican bills, of course not. We passed them because of the merits of the bills. But, we passed them.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is the only man that has injected partisan politics into this at all.

Mr. MORRIS. No; I beg your pardon.

Mr. JENSEN. Just because I happen to be a Republican and am proud of it, I did not raise the question of partisanship or politics at all.

Mr. MORRIS. No; I did not accuse the gentleman of it at all. I based my statement on the statement made by the gentleman from New York. Probably I used the wrong word in saying "partisanship" and I withdraw that

statement. He said "favoritism." Maybe I had in mind the fact that this bill applies to my own beloved State, not from my district, but over on the east side of my State, and maybe I had in mind a matter that the gentleman did not in any way indicate. But, the gentleman from New York did say that this bill was showing favoritism. But, gentlemen, it is not showing favoritism. There was never any effort on the part of this committee to show any favoritism toward any particular group. We were here trying to do for these good Indian people what we have done for good Indian people in other parts of the United States.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly there is no favoritism or partisan politics done in connection with those Five Civilized Tribes as far as this bill is concerned because, as I understand, they are about evenly divided between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

Mr. MORRIS. Let me clear up this question. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that I probably used the wrong term there. If I left any inference at all that he or anyone else was trying to inject partisanship in it, I withdraw it, because I did not mean it. What I intended to say was that the distinguished gentleman from New York had suggested that favoritism was being played here. I know he said it in good faith, no doubt, because of the terms of this bill. But, gentlemen, I assure you never was there any intention on the part of our committee to play politics nor to play partisanship.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have in my home county and district Pottawatomie and Ottawa Indians, and they are taking care of themselves, farming and in business. Had I not better introduce a bill to take care of them?

Mr. MORRIS. Probably the gentleman should.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Have I been negligent?

Mr. MORRIS. No, I do not say that. Just let me read this to you.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. Just tell me about my good Indians. I do not care about the Oklahoma Indians.

Mr. MORRIS. Let me read this. As to these particular tribes the record shows that there are 1,026 families, not individuals, but families, who have an annual income of below \$449. There are 2,810 who have between \$500 and \$999. There are 6,850 who have from \$1,000 to \$1,499 and there are 3,514 who have over \$1,500. That is why I made the statement that it would be tragic if a partisanship charge or charge of favoritism should defeat the bill. And I withdraw any suggestion of charge of partisanship. I did not mean to accuse anybody of playing politics. I was trying to defend against the charge of favoritism.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this is my last will and testament.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of Congress for 18 years. Soon after I became a Member of this body, I heard the deceptive voice of a former President proclaim to the people of the United States that our Government under Republican administrations was too extravagant, and loudly promise he would reduce the cost of Government at least 25 percent if he were elected President.

The people took him at his word and were sufficiently gullible to believe he was telling the truth. They accordingly elected him President because of this promise to reduce governmental expenses 25 percent under the cost of Republican expenditures. They believed no man could make such promises and not fulfill them. But he deceived them woefully. Instead of reducing governmental expenses 25 percent, he increased them tremendously until today instead of an indebtedness of approximately twenty-one billions at the time he took office, our Nation under him and his successor has a bonded indebtedness in excess of \$260,000,000,000, with an ever-increasing annual tax roll.

I was shocked and appalled at this deception and perfidy. I tried in every way since I have been here to cut down governmental expenses, all to no avail. Almost daily I arose in this Chamber and asked, "Where are you going to get the money?" For my persistence and courage in asking this question I have received hundreds of commendatory letters from every section of America. I have been called "Where are you going to get the money RICH," and importuned not to retire from Congress but to continue asking the question. However, since I have now uttered this slogan for 18 years and shall voluntarily return to private life, I now hope patriotic Members of this body will continue to ask the same question. It is a slogan more necessary today than when the former President first started us down the road to both moral and financial bankruptcy. It must be continued after I have departed from this body and answered my last roll call.

Therefore, being conscious of the necessity that the question, "Where are you going to get the money?", should not be permitted to die after my retirement from this body, I do hereby will, give, and bequeath said question to my friend, the Honorable LEON HARRY GAVIN, of the Nineteenth District of Pennsylvania, a patriot of unquestioned and well-known standing, to use daily in this body during his congressional life, and at his departure, to give and bequeath it to such patriotic successor as may to him seem most appropriate and just.

In witness whereof, I do hereby sign my name and affix my seal this 21st day

of September A. D. 1950. ROBERT F. RICH.

Witness: All the Members of the House of Representatives.

May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] that I want him as executor to see that this request is carried out. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather startling announcement, and a tremendous responsibility that I am asked to assume—to be the one selected to carry on the tradition of our good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, BOB RICH, and ask, "Where are we going to get the money?"

It is to be regretted that BOB RICH will not be a candidate again. He played a most important part in the Congress of the United States and his work will be long remembered. He is one of the outstanding Members of the House and has won for himself the hearty commendations of the membership on both sides of the aisle.

He will leave a place that will be difficult to fill and the grave responsibility he is charging me with is one that will keep me on the alert.

I want to say to my colleagues that I consider BOB RICH a sound, clear thinker, a patriotic, devoted, loyal American who has had the interests of his country and his people at heart at all times. He is one of the most outstanding men ever sent to the Congress of the United States from the great State of Pennsylvania. The phrase he coined—"Where are we going to get the money?" will be long remembered.

It is a phrase that should be reiterated here day after day because of the fact the old ship of state is wallowing in heavy seas and headed toward the rocks of bankruptcy. If we had cut down on our domestic spending and put our money into the national-defense program, we would be in a position to meet the heavy demands that are now being made and will be made upon us.

So I want to assure my good friend that, although it is a difficult assignment, I will to the best of my ability keep before the House his historic phrase, "Where are we going to get the money?" even though it will, in the future as it has in the past, fall upon deaf ears.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In spite of that oft-repeated phrase which has been willed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], has Mr. RICH—or do you, Mr. GAVIN, have any idea where we are going to get the money? Can you give us an answer to that question?

Mr. GAVIN. That is very difficult to answer, and really I would have to give it considerable thought because it is a problem with which we have been confronted here during the past 18 years. BOB RICH has been asking this question day in and day out for years, and he has never had an answer—although the national debt has been steadily mounting, and it is now about \$258,000,000,000. Certainly I cannot answer the question. The responsibility for answering this question belongs to the people who have

been advocating these spending programs over a long period of years. They are the ones to answer, "Where are we going to get the money?" The American taxpayer would be greatly interested in knowing the answer, too.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I will not object, however, I would like to know what are the gentleman's remarks about?

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. To show possibly where we can get the money.

Mr. GAVIN. Good. We will certainly be glad to have any suggestions. They would be timely.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my entire constituency is gravely concerned that Congress is planning to recess without having taken action on excess-profits-tax legislation. The recent action of the Congress in instructing the House Ways and Means Committee to prepare an excess-profits-tax measure for consideration when the Congress reconvenes in November of this year has been of some consolation to them, but I am taking this means of stressing the importance of insuring the average American citizen of protection from the ruthless profiteers who have already capitalized on the present conflict in Korea by effecting exorbitant increases in prices during the past several months.

The Eighty-first Congress, by its rapid action on legislation to increase our Armed Forces and to appropriate funds to meet the crisis in Korea, has given the American public the confidence that the United States stands willing and able to repel foreign aggressors. However, unless we enact the necessary legislation to protect our citizens from the gouging profiteers who have attacked our home front with piercing price tags, we cannot possibly be victorious in the present challenge to our democratic way of life.

It is not necessary for me to quote statistics to prove the abnormal increase in the wholesale price index of all commodities throughout the Nation since the outbreak of the armed conflict in Korea. Such data have been inserted in the RECORD heretofore and, furthermore, the housewife and small-business man needs only to review her or his cash balance for the past 3 months to detect the venom of big business.

The added cost to the Federal Government to carry out its present program to adequately defend the United States and our obligations as a member of the United Nations must, of course, be absorbed in the form of higher taxes. If, as provided in the new revenue act the private individual with a fixed income or small-business establishment is to be called upon to pay higher income taxes, there is absolutely no reason why big

business should not be called upon simultaneously to increase its contribution toward the cost of operating our governmental affairs. Ever since the shooting began in Korea, prices began to shoot upward. The same large companies which have not as yet been called upon to make a greater contribution toward the Government immediately increased the prices of all the things which are the necessities of life. They did this before there was a shortage of anything and without any increased labor costs. They are already profiteering from the great masses of people who are and will be called upon to make tremendous sacrifices and who are being taxed at a higher rate themselves.

The need for excess-profits-tax legislation is a must, not only in the sense of equality, but also as a step necessary to fill the inflationary gap caused by the increased deficit as a result of the appropriations needed to maintain an effective defense program. The revenue derived from this source would diminish the difference between the amount spent and the amount taken in by the Government in taxes and thereby stabilize our national economy. By cutting down the inflationary gap we can avoid all-out price and wage controls and prevent prices from skyrocketing and avoid rationing.

I sincerely hope that the Eighty-first Congress will maintain its splendid record of protecting the welfare of the average American citizen by reimposing the excess-profits tax without delay.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH GREEN

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 859), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Elizabeth Green, widow of Preston Green, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Preston Green.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SYMPOSIUM ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 284) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the symposium entitled "Executive Reorganization" be printed as a House document, and that 2,500 additional copies be printed, of which 2,000

copies shall be for the use of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and 500 copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO APPROVE PAYMENTS OF GRATUITIES DURING RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 860) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the period of any adjournment or recess of the House after the close of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress until January 3, 1951, the Clerk of the House is authorized to pay out of the contingent fund of the House an amount equal to 6 months' salary of any deceased employee of the House at the rate such employee was receiving at the time of his or her death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of any such employee to whomsoever in the judgment of the Clerk is justly entitled thereto subject to the approval of the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF SELECT COMMITTEE CREATED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 474

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 832) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 474 not to exceed \$40,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$30,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL EXPENSES, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 828) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, created by House Resolution 298, not to exceed \$25,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and

clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$20,000."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This is a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is it in order for me to offer an amendment, or will the gentleman from Virginia yield that I may offer an amendment to the committee amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia can yield to the gentleman to offer an amendment.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa to offer an amendment.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE offers the following amendment to the committee amendment: Strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced in good faith by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] who is chairman of the special committee engaged in studying lobbying activities, but at that time the gentleman from Pennsylvania felt he needed \$25,000. The House Administration Committee, after some investigation, concluded that \$20,000 would be sufficient, but I have talked with a number of members of the Committee on Lobby Investigation, and I think it is expected to bring the entire proceedings to a close at an early date. So I am of the opinion that \$10,000 should be sufficient to clean up the job.

I should like to say to some of the Members on this side of the aisle who have expressed to me the opinion that they did not want to give this committee any more money, or not more than \$5,000, I think \$10,000 is a splendid compromise. The investigation was ordered by the House a year ago, and this is a subject well worth study.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the gentleman will yield, I agree to the gentleman's amendment without any question.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman going to tell the House how soon he expects to have the printed report ready for distribution?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Five copies of the hearings, of which there are 10, have already been released. The others are in a state of publication. The report of the committee will go to the printers this week end, that is now a third revision of the report. No issuance of that report has as yet been made public, although there have been some excerpts, or parts of it possibly, released. Nevertheless, it will be a matter of about 2 weeks, I understand from the Govern-

ment Printing Office, before we shall get the galley proof on that draft. So after the committee has given that galley proof full consideration, which will probably take a week or 10 days, the report will be made available. As to when that will be released, I should not think that it will be ready by the 15th of October. There will be some 5,000 copies of that report printed, of which about 10 for every Member of Congress will be apportioned.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Do you think that \$10,000 will be sufficient to clean up the work of your committee?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think that the amount will be sufficient to complete the work of the committee.

Mr. STANLEY. If the gentleman from Iowa has concluded his remarks, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the action of the gentleman from Virginia in yielding to me.

I am not going to oppose this amendment or this resolution, with the understanding, of course, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, that the amount appropriated is to be used simply for the purpose of making the report, and winding up the affairs, of the committee.

I was interested in the remarks of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] as to when the committee report would be ready. It is my understanding that the Congress is to soon recess until sometime in late November. Most of us will be quite busily engaged in other activities during the month of October. There is grave question in my mind whether the committee can get back to Washington and can give the time necessary to the discussion of the so-called interim report of the committee before Congress reconvenes.

I am wondering if I can have assurance from the chairman that there will be no interim report put out, either officially or unofficially, either through action of the committee or action of the staff, prior to the time the full committee has met here to go over and to either approve or disapprove the report.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say in answer to the gentleman's query that adequate time will be given to the full committee to peruse and analyze the report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If it is necessary to wait until after the election—

Mr. BUCHANAN. I cannot assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then I want to serve notice now on the chairman of the committee and to the Members of the House that I reserve the right to submit a minority report.

Thus far there has been no discussion in the committee, to my knowledge, no detailed discussion at any rate, of the so-called interim reports which have already been printed and published. I am very much distressed and disturbed over the fact there have been continuous leaks from our committee, quotations in the newspapers and in the press

of the country from files which had never been made a part of the official committee hearings records, or had not been brought to the attention of the full committee. I am hoping some action can be taken so that in the weeks ahead the material which has been obtained by this committee and by its staff under subpoena and by other methods, will not be used for the purpose of smearing Members of Congress or other individuals, and that there will be no interim report put out unless the minority and the majority members of the committee get an opportunity to sit down and discuss this whole report matter, as we ought, in the American way.

I hope it will be possible to draft a report which is factual, and tells the whole story as to both sides of the street, and gives the true picture as it was developed in the committee hearings, without resorting to attempts to mislead anyone, or to misrepresent what the hearings actually show. We should also get down to the place pretty soon where we do that which we were ordered to do by the House: Bring in some sort of recommendation as to how we can better the lobby law. Thus far we have had much discussion of one thing, the lobby technique used on both sides of the street, and we have found such technique followed to be almost identically the same, whether by liberal or conservative groups—just that and nothing more.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does the gentleman say that the committee has not yet discussed lobbying?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; we have not discussed the betterment of existing law. We have not yet got down to considering or discussing what should be done to amend the Lobby Act, or what we should do to correct and better the law. Instead of that we have had a great many lengthy hearings in which the committee brought in certain people, pried into their affairs and discussed their activities. But what are we going to about it? That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. LECOMPTE. How long has this committee been in existence?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe it was created last October and started work in December with the staff and then began hearings in March. My only interest in bringing this problem up, and it is not a pleasant task or a pleasant thing I am doing, is because I have the firm conviction that someone or some group or groups have been using the committee as a vehicle to attempt to mislead the public, and to blacken the names and reputations of certain individuals and groups, by not giving a true picture or a completely factual report as to what we have learned on lobby activities. I certainly will not approve any biased, unfair report. I shall be compelled to put in a minority report, unless the report prepared by the staff can receive the approval of all members of the committee as being a fair report.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say that the purpose of all committees, of course, is to try to reach an agreement on a report.

That will certainly be the purpose of the House Committee on Lobbying Activities. That being the case, naturally the minority will be given an opportunity to file a minority report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LeCompte] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO DECLARE A RECESS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time during the balance of this week for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9219) to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 9219, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Stigler].

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, before entering into a discussion of the pending measure, I want to take this opportunity of thanking the members of the House Rules Committee for granting this rule. This bill will mean so much to the Indians of the eastern part of Oklahoma. It will ultimately mean the complete economic emancipation of those who are in the lowest income group from the supervision of the Indian Bureau and rehabilitate them so they can live on a par with the average white citizen.

I too would pay tribute to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. Morris], the chairman of the House In-

dian Affairs Subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee, whose reputation for being a hard worker is unexcelled in this body.

His committee, so I have been advised, has considered more Indian legislation under his leadership than any other previous House Indian Affairs Committee. I have had many Indians throughout the United States come to my office after appearing before the gentleman's committee and sing his praises as well as other members of his committee.

The splendid cooperation I have received from my other colleagues in Oklahoma is also worthy of honorable mention. Messrs. ALBERT, GILMER, STEED, MONRONEY, WICKERSHAM, and WILSON, who have Indian citizens in their congressional districts, have rendered valuable service to the Indians of these tribes in getting this piece of legislation before this body.

This bill, H. R. 9219, only affects Oklahoma, particularly the eastern part, where the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Indians, known as the Five Civilized Tribes, are located. The Five Civilized Tribes jurisdiction comprises some 40 counties in eastern Oklahoma. Their original habitat was east of the Mississippi River ranging all the way to the Atlantic seaboard. Generally speaking, the Cherokees were in the vicinity of Georgia and North Carolina; the Choctaws just west; the Chickasaws a bit north and west; the Seminoles somewhat to the south; and the Creeks farthest west.

All were removed to the Indian Territory, now the State of Oklahoma, in the 1830's. Their removal was the subject of a very renowned book called *The Trail of Tears*. It describes the misery, hardships, and the many deaths over the route. The removal evoked much bitterness.

When hearings were conducted before the House Indian Affairs Subcommittee on this bill, testimony was given showing the economic conditions of these Indian tribes. They were divided into four groups, namely:

Group 1, 7 percent, enjoy highest living standard which the State affords.

Group 2, 44 percent, middle-class, comfortable homes, well fed and clothed.

Group 3, 27 percent, low income, bad housing, difficult living, but not on relief.

Group 4, 22 percent, lowest standard, bad housing, disease, frustration, and all on relief.

Thus it will be seen that group No. 1 needs no financial assistance. Group No. 2 requires a source of credit for operation, purchase of land, and so forth, which many of them are unable to attain through regular credit channels. Group No. 3 can be rehabilitated through employment service, loans for land and education, housing, livestock, equipment, and operating expenses. Group No. 4 cannot be rehabilitated by credit alone, but must first be brought up to a subsistence level by grants and small loans after which some of them can then be raised by further grants and larger loans.

There are approximately 64,000 Indians residing within the area of the Five Civilized Tribes comprising some 14,200 families. Of this total population, ap-

proximately 26,000 are designated as restricted Indians. The Indian Agency which has jurisdiction over these Indians is located at Muskogee, Okla., which is in my district.

The purpose of this bill is as stated in its title—rehabilitation of the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes. It is believed this can be brought about by:

First. Revising the revolving loan provision to include land purchases on long-time plan for rehabilitation;

Second. Extending revolving loan purchases to include small business loans for other than farming;

Third. Expanding educational loan fund for deserving Indian youths;

Fourth. Devising some formula for erecting low-cost serviceable houses on time payment; and

Fifth. Providing an employment and replacement unit under Indian Service supervision to cooperate with State and Federal employment agencies for the placement of the able-bodied, substandard Indians.

Section 2 authorizes an appropriation of \$10,000,000 as a revolving credit loan created to assist in carrying out the purpose of the bill. These funds will be in addition to the fund contained in the revolving fund created by the act of June 18, 1934 known as the Wheeler-Howard Act and the act of June 26, 1936, known as the Oklahoma Welfare Act.

Section 5 (a) authorizes loans to individual Indians and to associations and corporate groups of Indians organized pursuant to the act of June 26, 1936, in the area of eastern Oklahoma occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes.

Section 4 authorizes the use of not to exceed 20 percent of any amounts appropriated under authority of section 2 of the bill to assist Indian borrowers during initial periods of operations of their credit-financed enterprises and with their education advancement. This amount is nonreimbursable. It is designed to help particularly those Indians who come within group No. 4 classification. The section further provides that nonreimbursable funds cannot be used for payment of taxes nor for payment of principal or interest on loans.

The act of Congress of April 26, 1906, closed the rolls of the Five Civilized Tribes except for some minor children living March 4, 1906, whose parents had been enrolled as members of these tribes. When the rolls of the tribes were finally approved, they showed the following number of Indians duly enrolled:

| | |
|-----------------|--------|
| Cherokees..... | 38,242 |
| Chickasaws..... | 5,978 |
| Choctaws..... | 20,471 |
| Creeks..... | 12,029 |
| Seminoles..... | 2,155 |
| Total..... | 78,875 |

According to a recent report of W. O. Roberts, area director of the Five Civilized Tribes, the situation today in the Five Civilized Tribes finds a contrasting state of affairs among our Indian people. The operations of State laws, citizenship, and increasing responsibilities thus placed upon Indians has worked very well for many. Many of our Indians of one-quarter or more Indian blood, and certainly those of less than one-quarter

blood are fully adjusted into the affairs of the area about them. They will be found among the successful doctors, lawyers, ministers, businessmen, farmers, skilled laborers, artists, musicians, and so forth. But on the other hand, it is certainly true that there are a very considerable number of Indian people in each and all of the Five Tribes who have not been able to adjust to the demands around them. Part of the difficulty may be found in the fact of poor selection of land to begin with. The less experienced and discerning were forced to take allotments back in the hills where the land was of exceedingly poor value. The fact of poor resources meant a corresponding slowness in the development of schools, good churches, business activity, good roads, and other evidences of progress. Such communities remained in a neglected state and as the land escaped from the Indians, white operators contributed further to community decline by denuding timberland and setting up a grazing or range type use of lands, pushing Indians farther aside. As a consequence, much of the third generation following statehood will be found in a sadly neglected state of affairs. The problem is essentially one of social and economic rehabilitation. The basic stock is good. If proper opportunities are brought into the area, progress is inevitable. We believe this bill is the answer to their needs.

Some statistical data regarding population of these tribes may be interesting. The following was prepared on January 3, 1950, by the area director for the Five Civilized Tribes for the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the House Public Lands Committee:

Regarding population

(a) Estimated total number of Indians of one-fourth or more degree of Indian blood by tribe:

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| Choctaw | 16,000 |
| Chickasaw | 3,200 |
| Cherokee | 25,600 |
| Creek | 16,640 |
| Seminole | 2,560 |

Total..... 64,000

(b) Estimated total number under 18 years for each tribe, on basis of 46 percent of population being under 18 years of age:

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| Choctaw | 7,360 |
| Chickasaw | 1,472 |
| Cherokee | 11,776 |
| Creek | 7,654 |
| Seminole | 1,178 |

Total..... 29,440

(c) Estimated total number of females for each tribe, on basis of 49 percent of population:

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| Choctaw | 7,840 |
| Chickasaw | 1,568 |
| Cherokee | 12,544 |
| Creek | 8,154 |
| Seminole | 1,254 |

Total..... 31,360

(d) Estimated total number of males for each tribe, on basis of 51 percent of population:

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| Choctaw | 8,160 |
| Chickasaw | 1,632 |
| Cherokee | 13,056 |
| Creek | 8,486 |
| Seminole | 1,306 |

Total..... 32,640

(e) Estimated total number of full-bloods for each tribe:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|
| Choctaw (32 percent of population) | 5,120 |
| Chickasaw (13 percent of population) | 416 |
| Cherokee (20 percent of population) | 5,120 |
| Creek (36 percent of population) | 5,990 |
| Seminole (40 percent of population) | 1,024 |

Summarizing, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is the consensus that this bill will provide the vehicle which will allow all of our Indians in the Five Civilized Tribes area in the lower and middle income bracket to take their places as most desirable and thrifty citizens of the community where they are. The objective cannot be attained without this help. Enactment of such legislation is long past due. In view of the fact that the Indians whom this legislation is designed to assist, are still wards of the Government, our Government has a solemn obligation and a sacred trust to extend every assistance possible which will assist them in attaining economic independence. Until this is done a great debt remains unpaid. I trust, Mr. Chairman, this bill will pass.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some misunderstanding as to this bill, the history behind it, and the purpose of the legislation.

This bill authorizes a rehabilitation program for the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma. It provides for a well-rounded economic development program of these Indians, based on the experience we have had in other legislation and in rehabilitating Indians on other reservations.

The first legislation of this kind related to the Navajo Indians. We vetoed that bill up 2 years ago. It was vetoed by the President, and after revising it, this Congress passed it again. It provides for a large sum of money, some \$80,000,000 or \$90,000,000, for the rehabilitation of the Navajo Reservation Indians. That bill was passed only after a long and extensive study. The program was based on experience in handling rehabilitation of the Indians.

Since then we have had applications from different tribes for a somewhat similar program. I believe there is one in North Dakota, one in Minnesota, and two in Montana, the Navajo bill, and this one for the Oklahoma Indians.

It is based on a loan program to a large extent. Several years ago the Congress set up a revolving loan fund for rehabilitation of the Indians. We set up a Bureau inside the Indian Service for the handling of that revolving loan fund. It started out with a small appropriation, and has grown to where last year I believe it was \$7,000,000. I think it was increased to \$12,000,000 by the Appropriations Committee this year, when you include repayments that have been made that have added to the fund.

We have had a great deal of experience in handling the fund. It has worked out very well. The repayments have been good. The effect on the Indians has been good, by and large. The experience we have gained in handling

the fund has helped us in writing this bill. The loans are sometimes made to individual Indians and sometimes to associations, and at other times to the Indian organization, depending on the circumstances and conditions in the particular tribe. The experience gained from the revolving fund loans shows that it has been wiser to make the loans to associations and permit these associations of Indians in turn to lend that money to the individual Indians, the association guaranteeing the loan. That, of course, is based on the experience we have had in making loans to white farmers under the AAA program. The repayments have been good. The interest has been repaid, and on the whole, the experience has been good on these loans. I visited the Indians in Florida this spring. There we made a large loan for the rehabilitation of those Indians. They invested the money in cattle. The Indians in Florida have a very good loan program at this time. They have some 2,000 cattle. We were told on our visit there that in a matter of 2 or 3 years the loan would be repaid 100 percent. That means the complete rehabilitation of the Indians there.

So, based on the experience we have had in other cases we have brought in 5 or 6 bills for the rehabilitation of individual Indian tribes, the loans to be made on the basis of the experience we have gained in making revolving-fund loans and rehabilitation loans. I think if we are going to give these poorer Indians, the Indians with incomes of less than \$400 the chance to rehabilitate and develop themselves to the point where they will have the capacity, the experience and background to carry on, some such program as this is necessary. Possibly this is not the right program, but it is the only one we have been able to develop to date. I think we should go along with this kind of program at this time until we find a better way to rehabilitate the Indians.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWARD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I asked the gentleman from Oklahoma to yield when he had the floor, but the gentleman declined to do so. The purpose of my question is this: There has been talk, as he said, of possible favoritism here. Can the gentleman tell us very simply whether this bill is the same kind of bill which we passed for other Indians in other parts of the country, or whether it is different, and if so in what respect it is different.

Mr. D'EWARD. This bill differs in the case of one or two of the other bills in that the tribe is not asked to guarantee the loan. I might say none of these bills have passed the other body except the Navajo bill. They are all there and it seems to me they are going to stay there. This bill, however, does differ from one or two of the other bills in that the tribe itself is not asked to guarantee the loans. If these loans are made through the association of the Civilized Tribes, then the association undoubtedly will be asked to guarantee the loans.

Mr. KEATING. Has the Navajo bill passed both House and Senate, and is it now law?

Mr. D'EWARD. The Navajo bill passed both Houses about a year ago.

Mr. KEATING. Did that bill contain a provision for guaranteeing the loans which has been referred to here?

Mr. D'EWARD. I would not want to say for certain, but I do believe it is guaranteed only by associations not by the tribe. The Navajo bill has only been in operation about a year—it carries an authorization of some \$80,000,000; but I believe the Appropriations Committee appropriated eight or nine million under that program this year, and it is just barely getting started.

Mr. KEATING. Have we ever passed any bill relating to Indians which did not contain a guarantee provision?

Mr. D'EWARD. None of them have become law that I know of.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWARD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Is there not a difference between those Indians who live on reservations, and whose property is tribal property, and the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes, who have no tribal lands but who are individual citizens and live separately?

Mr. D'EWARD. I would say that the witnesses from Oklahoma made that point before the committee. I will have to admit that I was not wholly satisfied with it, because those Indians have had judgments against the United States for rather large sums of money. I believe they have claims against the United States Government at this time. Those claims and those judgments could doubtless be used to guarantee these loans, if they were willing to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWARD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder why it is, at a time when we are importing foreign labor from Mexico, and a great deal of it goes into States bordering on Oklahoma, that these people are not put to work at farm work and allowed to earn a living, instead of importing Mexican labor.

Mr. D'EWARD. I am glad the gentleman from New York brought up that point. One of the items for which the nonreimbursable part of this bill will be used is to provide guidance for off-reservation work. I think the gentleman will remember that a couple of years ago we appeared before his committee and asked for a small sum to help the off-reservation work for employment of Indians outside the Navajo Reservation. The committee granted a few thousand dollars for that purpose. I will say to the gentleman that has been one of the most successful programs we have had to rehabilitate the Navajo Indians, up to date. I visited the Navajo Indian Reservation last fall, and every able-bodied Navajo Indian was out working, under the guidance of the program that was set up. There were applications for more Indians than there were Indians able to go.

When you take an Indian who cannot speak English, who has had no educa-

tion, and put him on a railroad job or in a mining job or in a beet field, he must have some guidance in order to get those funds back to his family, in order to meet the social conditions surrounding his job, and also guidance under the law so that he will get unemployment insurance when he gets home. Therefore, that program for guidance of off-reservation work for Indians has been one of the most successful efforts that we have had so far in rehabilitating the Indian.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWARD. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] points out that many of the Indians are extremely wealthy, and I believe the report bears out that statement.

Can the gentleman tell me if these wealthy Indians are engaged in any charitable enterprise for their less prosperous brothers?

Mr. D'EWARD. I have never visited Oklahoma. I am not in a position to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House bill 9219, a measure which will be of inestimable value to the members of the great Five Civilized Tribes who reside principally in eastern Oklahoma.

I cannot undertake a discussion of the merits of this proposal without first commending my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] for the tireless and conscientious effort he has devoted to this matter and for the dispatch with which he has brought it to the floor of this House. His efforts will be appreciated not only by the Five Civilized Tribes but by the entire State of Oklahoma, because, in the final analysis, this bill will be of inestimable value to all of the people of our State.

I also want to take just a moment to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] who is the author of this bill. No Member of this House has manifested more constructive statesmanship with respect to the problems of the Five Civilized Tribes. I believe that, if you will check the various measures he has sponsored through to enactment since his election to Congress, you will agree with me that his record in this field is unsurpassed in the annals of Congress.

This is a rehabilitation measure. A vital, active program of this kind is sorely needed. While some 10 percent of the members of these tribes enjoy the highest standard of living known to our people, many of them, particularly in remote agricultural regions in the hill country of our State, live on submarginal land and have neither the educational opportunities, economic resources, nor technical skills to raise their living standards even to minimum levels. Many of them have been reared on farms and, with a little help, would make successful farmers. They need money to

purchase land or equipment with which to carry on their operations. In some cases they need advice on modern farming practices. They are not asking for charity. This bill merely authorizes loans, on convenient terms, for business, agricultural, and educational purposes.

In my judgment there are two main reasons why legislation of this kind is necessary:

First. Funds now made available to these tribes under present legislation are inadequate to do the job.

Second. Restrictions on these loans under existing law are such that in many instances, if not in most instances, these loans cannot be made to those who need it most. Credit restrictions are too severe. The emphasis in making these loans should be on the character of the borrower and not on his collateral.

In my judgment no measure ever submitted to this House will do more for the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma than the pending bill. I hope the House will pass it without a dissenting vote.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the approach to this proposition to my mind is entirely wrong; in other words, here is a group of people who are said to have incomes—a thousand families of them with incomes of under \$500; and 2,800 families with incomes of under \$1,000; and yet we have the spectacle in Texas, in Arkansas, and adjoining States of the farmers bringing in a lot of laborers from Mexico who are just as different from the standpoint of language and custom as are the Indians—and these people not earning money enough to live on. The whole picture does not present evidence that the governmental authorities have used any sense at all in approaching this problem.

Ten million dollars is provided in this bill.

The income of these people in the last year is reported to have been \$22,607,000, according to the committee's report. That report indicates that of this income \$16,400,000 was from agriculture; \$2,000,000 from welfare assistance—I suppose that came from the Federal Government; and \$2,718,000 from oil rights.

It would seem as if when the Federal Government is being asked to give \$10,000,000 to set these Indians up in business that we should ask a guaranty from the different tribes to which the loans and advances are made. Frankly, I do not believe it is the right approach at all.

The Senate has passed nothing except the Navajo bill. The probabilities are that they will not, and under all the circumstances it is to my mind a great mistake that we pass this bill.

This whole problem should be considered in one bill and they should all be treated alike. In Montana the tribes were required to guarantee the repayment of loans; and there is not any reason why these people should not. In other words we ought not to treat one group one way and another group another way. A great deal better effort should be made by the Indian agencies to help provide the employment service

that would be needed to get these people to work. I cannot understand why the farmers in these States will pay the railroad fares of workers brought from Mexico and not be willing to pay the railroad fare of Indians and employ them and help them make a living.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The point was made by one of the Members from Oklahoma that there is some reason why these Indians should be treated differently because they are not living on reservations. The gentleman is more of an Indian expert than I. Is it not a fact that they are organized into tribes and that the tribes could guarantee these loans just the same even though they are not living on reservations?

Mr. TABER. I understand that is so.

Mr. KEATING. There are tribal funds, are there not?

Mr. TABER. I have not been given the details of it; I do not know whether the committee has or not, but I understand that a number of these Indian tribes have claims against the United States right now.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very meritorious measure because it is about time that we do something for the Indians of our country. This is a way of getting them off the relief rolls and getting them into some sort of program of rehabilitation, industry and business, getting them into private enterprise and thus carry out the American way of life instead of keeping many of them on dole and relief all the time.

We recently passed a bill appropriating many millions of dollars for loans to Europe. Later on we passed the so-called point 4 program covering Africa and other parts of the world. There was not much opposition to those bills. All of that money, many billions, is virtually a gift. It will never be paid back.

However, the bill now under consideration for our own native Americans, sets up a fund of \$10,000,000 to be lent, not given, mind you, to the Indians for business enterprise or for any other endeavor by which they can make a living for themselves. This money will be lent only on worth-while enterprises and on application. The money will be paid back with interest. You have the integrity, the word, and the fine record of similar experience of these Indians that this money will be paid back.

Mr. Chairman, this is an investment in private enterprise, it is an investment in an effort to lift up the level of the destitute Indians of that area and there should be no opposition to it. I am sure most all of the Republicans will support this very meritorious bill as the Republicans always have supported Indian legislation in the past.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I can verify what the gentleman has said about this be-

ing a good investment and the money will be repaid. I know personally many of these Indians from the Five Civilized Tribes who are in charge of just this sort of work. The repayment of similar moneys has been phenomenal, it has been almost 100 percent. The gentleman is exactly right about this being a good investment to set these people on their feet.

Mr. HAGEN. I thank the gentleman. The problems of the various tribes of Indians throughout the country are different. I have a bill, H. R. 9017, pending, covering the Indians of Minnesota. Their opportunities and problems are different than those of Oklahoma. If I get reelected to this House, I hope to push my bill through for the welfare of the Indians of the State of Minnesota. It is a bill to promote the rehabilitation of the bands of Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, located on the Red Lake, White Earth, Greater Leech Lake, Bois Fort or Nett Lake, Mille Lac, Fond du Lac, Grand Portage, and Vermillion Lake Indian Reservations, and for other purposes.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that every Member of this House who knows anything about the Indian problems and how this House is operated and how the Committee on Appropriations for the Indian Service has functioned over the past 8 years since I have been a member of this committee knows that I am one Member who has insisted that the Indians be treated properly. I may say, too, that I was chairman of the committee when we called the Director of the Indian Health Service and of the Indian Educational Service before the committee on several occasions and insisted that the Indians have better hospitals, have better schools, and be treated in the manner they deserve. So no one can accuse me of being against the Oklahoma Indians or the Montana Indians or the Oregon Indians, or, in fact, any Indians in the whole of these United States because, certainly, I have been their friend.

However, this is the problem we face today on every Indian Reservation as well as with these Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma. We set them out on a bunch of rocks and dust and mountains and expect them to make a living, instead of appropriating money for soil conservation and moisture conservation to build up their land. We let their land go to pot year in and year out, and it becomes less productive as time goes on. Here we have a request for \$10,000,000 to loan money to these Five Civilized Tribes, but we are not going to do a thing to build up that soil on which they must make a living. We can appropriate \$10,000,000 this year, we can appropriate \$100,000,000 next year, and keep on appropriating for those Five Civilized Tribes and all the rest of the Indians in America, and their living conditions will get worse and worse and worse until we build up their soil on which they live so that they can make a living. We are going at this whole thing backward.

Whenever we appropriate in this manner for any Indian tribe we are not do-

ing them justice. We should take this \$10,000,000 and go down there and get soil-conservation technicians and show those Indians how to conserve their soil, and to make it more productive. Then in a few years their problem would be solved. They would not ask for any money. They would not ask for any loans. That holds true of every Indian reservation in America today.

The small crops that they raise down there are insignificant, as the report will show. Why? Because they have no soil on which to raise a decent crop. Then they get sick because the food that is grown in that soil does not have the right elements, so they do not receive the right kind of nutriment to keep them healthy, let alone keep them well fed. So, we keep on. It is a vicious circle that we have gotten into with this Indian problem, and, as I say again, it will never be solved until we build up their soil so that they can make a living on it. Mother Earth is the only economic generating plant we have in this world, and when the power from Mother Earth is so weakened that it will not raise the stuff to feed those Indians like the rest of us folks, then we are in trouble. You could build a 100-foot wall around the Navajo Reservation and put all the factories and all the smart people in the world in there, and if you did not build up that soil they would starve to death. So, we are going at this time completely backward. This money will be wasted.

If I thought for a minute that this money would do those Indians any good I would be up here fighting for them, but we are doing them a distinct disservice with this kind of business.

I wish you who represent those Indians down there would see to it that you get some appropriations to build up their soil. Then in a few years they will be so well off that your Indian problem will be solved and you will not have to be coming back here asking for \$10,000,000 or \$1,000,000 or even \$100 to support these Indians.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make a brief observation and likewise to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question or two.

There is located in the congressional district of one of the highly esteemed members of the Committee on Public Lands—who is absent today in view of the serious illness of his mother, and I refer to Mr. REDDEN, my own colleague from North Carolina—a large group of Cherokee Indians. I think I am correct in saying that the forebears of the Cherokees described in this legislation formerly came from North Carolina. The question I wish to address to the chairman is this: What do the Cherokees of North Carolina now receive that the Cherokees covered by this bill are not receiving?

Mr. D'EWART. If the gentleman will yield, I visited that reservation a short time ago. We examined what we thought was necessary to rehabilitate that tribe. We decided we could not do better than to build a tourist camp and a theater

at the east entrance to the Smoky National Park. We loaned the Indians money for that program. Just this week I talked to a man who was very much interested in that project and he told me that that theater had been full every day this summer and they had come to the point where they needed more funds now to extend and enlarge that tourist camp. We loaned them the money for what they needed, and they were able to rehabilitate themselves through that.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON. Just this last week we passed a bill allowing them to lease certain lands not far from the parkway, a public road. As the gentleman from Montana said, we sent a committee down there, and those were the needs they stressed most. They are also eligible under the Wheeler-Howard Act.

Mr. DEANE. Are the Cherokees in North Carolina eligible for the type of loans that are allowed under this bill?

Mr. PETERSON. Not under this bill, but they are eligible under the general borrowing fund and under the Wheeler-Howard Act for loans. Provision has been made for them.

Mr. DEANE. Is that true of other tribes scattered throughout the country?

Mr. PETERSON. If their problem is such and their tribal account is such that they would be eligible, they would have a right to come in and ask for consideration under the act. They would rather deal with the tourist travel than engage in agriculture.

I may say that the gentleman from North Carolina was very diligent in connection with this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this bill among other things provides as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to undertake, within the limits of the sums from time to time appropriated under authority of law, a program of basic economic and other improvements for the benefit of the members of the Five Civilized Tribes (Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole) and other Indians living in the area of eastern Oklahoma occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes. Such program shall include assistance to the Indians in obtaining employment and adjustments related thereto. The purpose of such program is the establishment of such Indians on a self-supporting basis and the conservation, development, and more efficient utilization of their resources, both physical and human, to the end that Federal services and supervision with respect to such Indians may be discontinued as no longer necessary.

In other words, the purpose of the law is to rehabilitate the Indians and help them attain an economic and educational status so that they eventually will no longer be wards of the Government. We are moving forward with that program. It seems to me the program has a very worthy objective indeed. This \$10,000,000 which is provided here is not a gift, it is a loan. It is true that 20 percent of it is not reimbursable, but that is a provision which has been put in all of these bills. I believe the amount has

varied in some of the bills. I believe one bill provided that 17 percent was not reimbursable, and another one went down as far as 10 percent not being reimbursable, but I am sure that at least one and perhaps several have provided that 20 percent of the amount is not to be reimbursable, just as this bill provides.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to fuss with any individual in the House, and that has never been my intention. I did not refuse to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I have the highest regard for the gentleman. I yielded to other gentlemen, but my time was limited and I could not yield to him.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. If I used the word "refuse", I would like to correct the Record. I knew the gentleman is very generous in yielding at all times. I have the same high regard for the gentleman as he has stated he has for me, and I would not want the Record to indicate anything to the contrary.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman a great deal. I appreciate that. I certainly mean every word that I say, and I know the gentleman means every word he says.

No, Mr. Chairman, I would not want to fuss with any of the gentlemen on either side of the aisle about this matter. I do want to make the Record clear, and I believe it is clear now, that we on our committee are trying our best to solve the problems of the Indians as they are presented to us, regardless of where they come from. We have had some very knotty problems in our committee. We have passed a number of bills. I see my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], one of the great and distinguished Members of the House of Representatives. He will testify to that fact. We passed legislation with reference to the Indians in the great State of New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. And that bill with reference to the Indians in the State of New York removed the Indians from the United States courts and placed them under the jurisdiction of the New York State courts.

Mr. MORRIS. I see the gentleman's point, but I want to proceed now and show you that our committee is taking these matters as they come. We have dealt with the Indians from California, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, and to some extent with the Indians of North Carolina. We have not dealt with their problems as much as I think we can and as much as I hope we will. I think we can do more. I might explain this to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE]. The Cherokees want some industries on their reservation there in North Carolina. We passed a bill which will help them to get some industries, at least one industry. We have considered bills with reference to the Indians in North Dakota, and South Dakota, Montana, Oklahoma, and most all over the Nation. We are certainly not trying to

show any favoritism for one section as against another. We are just not doing that. The truth of the matter is simply that each tribe does present, to some extent, an individual problem. I believe all Members will agree as to that. If you want to do justice you cannot treat every tribe exactly alike, because if you do you will not be meting out justice.

I give you my word of honor and I believe you gentlemen will accept it, that certainly there has been no disposition on the part of any member of our committee, whether on the left side or the right side of the aisle to show favoritism to any group in any way.

I want to express my sincere appreciation to all the members of the committee.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House that during the wars the United States has been engaged in in recent years, the Indians have contributed more to the Red Cross and have bought more bonds and have contributed more soldiers in proportion to their population than any other race.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say I appreciate from the bottom of my heart the expression on the part of the author of this bill with regard to what little I have done to help pass this bill. Although I know he is sincere in his compliments yet I feel that they are more than I deserve. We have worked hard on this bill in the committee, the same as on other bills.

The distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER], who has Indian blood himself, is one of the very best Members of this House. We all know that. He is certainly a most distinguished and outstanding legislator. I also sincerely appreciate the expression on the part of my colleague, another truly outstanding Member of this House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], who also has a number of these Indians in his district; both have worked diligently and effectively in behalf of this bill. I express my sincere appreciation to the distinguished and outstanding member of our committee, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] who is on the other side of the aisle, for his help in this matter, as well as to all other members of our committee. I assure you that we know that we are not infallible. Certainly we make mistakes, but it is our sincere and honest purpose to bring good legislation here, free from any bias or prejudice.

I wish to express my appreciation to the other Members of the Oklahoma delegation who have been working with the committee in regard to this bill and other Indian bills.

Finally, I want to express my very great appreciation to the great chairman of this Public Lands Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], who has been so helpful to all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill. I am sincerely supporting it. This is not due entirely to the fact that my good friends from Oklahoma are sponsoring the measure and my good friend, Judge MORRIS, has been chairman of the subcommittee which reported the bill, although these facts do have a great influence upon my favorable attitude toward it. I sincerely favor the bill because I think that it is a businesslike step toward enabling these Indians in eastern Oklahoma to better their economic status in life and to make them self-supporting. I know personally the condition of some of these Indians, especially the Cherokees, but before I indicate my reasons for supporting the legislation I want to express appreciation for the good work of Chairman MORRIS who conducted the hearings and also Congressman D'EWART, of Montana, who has taken a prominent part in all Indian matters.

Congressman TOBY MORRIS represents a district in western Oklahoma and I believe has few if any Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes as his constituents. However, he has thrown himself valiantly into this fight as he has on numerous other occasions where the welfare of Indians in remote parts of the country was involved. As I told him on the floor of the House at the time the Navajo rehabilitation bill was enacted, "He has builded better than he knows."

Great confusion has appeared in the discussion today on this bill. I have heard gentlemen say that we should treat all Indians alike in legislating for them. Now that needs some qualification. Certainly I do not favor discrimination. Certainly we should deal with all Indians fairly and justly with as much wisdom as we possess, but we cannot treat them all exactly alike in such rehabilitation bills involving economic and social matters. Many times in the Indian Affairs Committee I have used the expression, "There are Indians and Indians." There is a great range of difference among our American Indians in the scale of their economic and social and cultural progress. I regard Cherokees as standing very high on the list. I could name some reservation Indians in the far Southwest, ranking very low on that same scale. Obviously what would be wise for one would not be wise for the other. Certainly it would not be wise or proper to apply to the Five Civilized Tribes the same standards which we applied to the Navajos who are reservation Indians.

Of course Navajos are just as truly American citizens as are Cherokees, but there is a vast difference in their economic and cultural situation. Cherokees are no longer under tribal government, they do not own land and other property in common as do the Navajos, for they hold their property as American citizens individually, therefore it would be improper and unworkable to require the whole tribe to guarantee the return of the loans which may be made to them under this legislation. A few of them are fairly well fixed, others are very poor. Their relationship is more social

and fraternal than the legal tribal relationship which they once had.

I have personally some knowledge of the richer and also of the poorer members of these tribes because I lived among them many years ago. I visited with a Cherokee friend at Tahlequah, Okla., last Christmastime, a man about my own age. He later became a university graduate, but forty-odd years ago he graduated from the old Cherokee Male Seminary near Tahlequah, Indian Territory. While at his home last Christmas other Cherokee men visited us and told me a great deal about business matters and other economic conditions among all classes of those Indian citizens.

One of them, a businessman told me, and he also stated the same on the witness stand before our committee handling this bill, that he had been for years instrumental in lending funds to his Indian neighbors high and low, rich and poor, and that the percentage of collections was extraordinarily high. He was not a glass-eyed banker but one of the old school—a splendid judge of human nature, a level-headed businessman, and close enough to those to whom loans were made that he was able to report a higher percentage of collections and a smaller percentage of losses than is usual in such lines of credit business. With such Cherokee men as these friends and others like them, in charge of the loan program contemplated in this bill it would not only be in safe hands but would undoubtedly be highly fruitful in an economic and business sense. This constitutes my reason for supporting the bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to show for the record that this is no effort to favor this group of Indians over others. Whatever provision might seem to favor them is due to the peculiar situation existing. It is intended in this bill that the various groups should guarantee, where they have their committees, through committees rather than a tribe. Under the Navajo bill, since the question arose I went back and looked it up, and there is no provision there for guarantee. That was an outright rehabilitation bill. I find that in the bills we passed recently two of the bills had the same percentage with reference to grants as does this bill.

The testimony before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs showed clearly that a greater portion of the loans would be paid back. It has been the feeling of the committee that it is much better to have loans than grants, and have these loans paid back. It is shown clearly that in one case a loan of \$700 was made to an Indian and he was rehabilitated and ultimately deposited in the bank \$3,500 the next year. He repaid the loan.

A similar provision was made with reference to a loan of \$500, where it was paid back and the man had a \$1,000 toward the rehabilitation of his farm. I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. PETERSON. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to undertake, within the limits of the sums

from time to time appropriated under authority of law, a program of basic economic and other improvements for the benefit of the members of the Five Civilized Tribes (Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole) and other Indians living in the area of eastern Oklahoma occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes. Such program shall include assistance to the Indians in obtaining employment and adjustments related thereto. The purpose of such program is the establishment of such Indians on a self-supporting basis and the conservation, development, and more efficient utilization of their resources, both physical and human, to the end that Federal services and supervision with respect to such Indians may be discontinued as no longer necessary.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated in addition to the revolving fund created by the acts of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), and June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1968), the sum of \$10,000,000 to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act. Sums collected in repayment of loans made from such fund and sums collected as interest or other charges thereon shall be credited to such fund, and shall be available for the purposes for which the fund was established. Individuals of less than one quarter degree of Indian blood shall not be eligible for financial assistance made available through such fund under authority of sections 3 and 4 of this act.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed under the act of June 18, 1934, as amended, is authorized to make loans for any purposes calculated to carry out the provisions of this act, from amounts appropriated under authority of section 2, to individual Indians and to associations and corporate groups of the Five Civilized Tribes, organized pursuant to the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1957), as of the date of the approval of this act (including other Indians living in the area of the Five Civilized Tribes).

(b) Reimbursement to the United States for any loan made from amounts appropriated under authority of section 2 shall be made within 30 years from the date on which such loan is made: *Provided*, That no loan shall be made with a maturity date later than June 30, 1980.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, is authorized to use, on a nonreimbursable basis, not to exceed 20 percent of any amount appropriated under authority of section 2 of this act to assist individual Indians in carrying on enterprises during initial periods of operations, and to assist individual Indians in educational advancement. No amount authorized to be used under authority of this section shall be used to make payments of taxes, principal, or interest, or any part thereof, on loans made under authority of this act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe such rules and regulations with respect to loans made to individual Indians and to associations and corporate groups under this act, loans by associations and corporate groups to their members, and assistance provided on a nonreimbursable basis under section 4, as may be necessary to secure the United States against financial loss and to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out the balance of the page down to and including line 19 on page 3, and insert:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the establishment of a revolving fund to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act. Sums collected in repayment of loans made from such fund and sums collected as interest or other charges thereon shall be credited to such fund, and shall be available for the

purposes for which the fund was established. Individuals of less than one-quarter degree of Indian blood shall not be eligible for financial assistance made available through such fund under authority of sections 3 and 4 of this act.

"Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make loans, from the revolving fund established by this act, to individual Indians and to associations and corporate groups organized pursuant to the Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), in the area of eastern Oklahoma occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes, for any purposes calculated to carry out the provisions of this act.

"(b) Reimbursement to the United States for any loan made from the revolving fund established by this act shall be made within 30 years from the date on which such loan is made: *Provided*, That no loan shall be made with a maturity date later than June 30, 1980.

"Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to use, on a nonreimbursable basis, not to exceed 20 percent of the amounts appropriated for the revolving fund established by this act to assist individual Indians in carrying on enterprises during initial periods of the operations, and to assist individual Indians in educational advancement. No amount authorized to be used under authority of this section shall be used to make payments of taxes, nor of principal or interest, or any part thereof, on debts incurred under authority of this act."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER to the committee amendment: On page 4, line 16, after "1980," strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and unless the tribe involved shall guarantee the payment of the loan."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to try to bring this bill in line with bills that have been passed for other Indians. There is not any reason in the world why the tribes involved in this set-up should not guarantee repayment of the loans.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. STIGLER. Would the gentleman mind telling the House how he expects his amendment to work?

Mr. TABER. Just like similar provisions work in other places where the tribes guarantee the repayment.

Mr. STIGLER. Is the gentleman aware that the Congress on April 26, 1906, passed an act to wind up the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes and that the tribal governments were dissolved as of that date?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman means they have no tribes and no property or anything else?

Mr. STIGLER. Very, very little, sir.

Mr. TABER. Very, very little. I understand that a lot of these people have claims against the Government that are pending presently.

Mr. STIGLER. That is true, but they are individual claims.

Mr. TABER. Why should not those claims be involved in something like this?

Mr. STIGLER. What the gentleman proposes would be absolutely impossible under the law at the present time.

Mr. TABER. I do not think so

Mr. STIGLER. I do not want to argue with the gentleman, but I feel very, very positive about it.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman means that they have not any tribes at all?

Mr. STIGLER. They have no tribal status now. As I said a moment ago, Congress on April 26, 1906, passed an act entitled "An act to wind up the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes." Prior to that there were tribal governments, we had our courts and we had our schools supported from tribal funds, but with the approach of the white man legislation was passed by the Congress looking ultimately to allotments in severalty of the land which each tribe owned in common at that time. Back in February of 1893, Congress passed legislation authorizing the creation of what was known as the Dawes Commission which went ahead and made an enumeration of the different members of the tribes which ultimately led to individual allotment of tribal property and the tribes own very very little property at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. For the information of the gentleman from New York—and I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] will verify this, he having been attorney for the Choctaws for a number of years, every claim against the Government became a claim of an individual citizen because by act of Congress these different members of the tribes became citizens of the United States and their tribal affiliation was abolished. So these claims which do exist are claims of individuals against the Government.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman means there are no tribal claims against the Government whatever?

Mr. ALBERT. The claims are brought in the name of the tribe, but the equities belong to the individual citizens and are required to be paid to them as soon as they go into tribal funds.

Mr. TABER. How could a suit be brought in the name of a tribe if the tribe does not exist? That is something beyond the understanding of an ordinary lawyer. You cannot do such things.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. STIGLER. I do not want to have the membership misled. At the present time the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians do have a claim pending before the United States Indian Claims Commission. The claim on behalf of the Choctaws amounts to approximately \$8,000,000. A judgment was handed down giving them approximately \$3,000,000. It has not been determined yet whether that decision of the court will be appealed. But outside of that the Choctaws and the Chickasaws have very, very little tribal domain that is owned in common, all the land has been allotted individually.

Mr. TABER. Even that \$3,000,000 is a considerable amount. It probably would be at least half as much as could possibly be loaned under this bill. I still

do not believe we should pass up an opportunity to require these folks to pledge their securities just like other people have to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 14, noes 30.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9219) to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 843, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak today about lobbying but the colloquy between Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. BUCHANAN changed my mind.

It has been suggested by several Members who have been interested in the activities of various lobbying groups that I once again call to the attention of the Congress a matter I discussed back in January 1949.

I think rather than take the time to make a lengthy speech, I am merely go-

ing to insert at this point a copy of remarks I made back in January of 1949:

Mr. FUNCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call the attention of Members of the Congress to something new that I have inaugurated in the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts. Several of the Congressmen who have asked me for details of the plan have suggested that I bring it to the attention of all the Members at the opening of this session of the Congress.

I have established a congressional council for the Second Massachusetts District. It is an experiment in democracy that is intended to give the people a greater voice in Government than they now have. The congressional council is basically and fundamentally the creation of a people's lobby. It is aimed to subject the Congressman to the only type of lobbying power he is not subjected to at the present time: a lobbying power of the average, everyday citizens who are the constituents we represent.

We all know that every Congressman is constantly lobbied by various interests and pressure groups. I do not use the word "lobby" in its sinister or underhanded connotation because a great part of the lobbying that is done is carried on openly and publicly. Most so-called lobbying is simply an attempt by certain interests to persuade the Congressman to think and vote along certain lines. That is the function of those who lobby for farmers, labor unions, manufacturers and industrialists, veterans, old-age groups, and so on.

A great part of the legislation passed by Congress, both good and bad, has been written or promoted by lobbyists. The influence lobbyists may have on our legislation is perhaps indicated by statistics which show that in the last Congress over a thousand registered lobbyists spent over a reported \$6,000,000 in their attempts to show why certain legislation should be passed or defeated. There were, of course, other unregistered lobbyists who spent unreported sums of money for the same purpose.

Lobbying can be both beneficial and harmful. It is beneficial when it brings to the Congressman's attention certain facts and arguments showing why certain legislation will be good or bad. That educational phase of lobbying is advantageous to the country. Lobbying is harmful when it does not disclose all the material facts to those who must vote on legislation that will affect all the people. Unfortunately, the average lobbyist's function is merely to represent his particular client's side of the story. He skillfully performs that duty without feeling any obligation to ascertain or inform the Congressman of the effect of that legislation upon other groups or segments of the population whose interests may be adverse or conflicting to the lobbying influence.

I assume that lobbying either should not or cannot be abolished. Its educational benefits should certainly be retained. While its deleterious effects can probably never be completely suppressed, they should at least be controlled. Is there any reasonably practicable way to achieve that result?

I can merely outline my own suggestion which, to the best of my knowledge, has never before been tried. Briefly it is this: I have called upon many of the leading citizens of my district to form what I have termed a congressional council. The group is nonpartisan and nonpolitical and has not been hand-picked by me. Of the 45 members only 5 were selected by me. The rest were chosen by their own organizations or by virtue of their election by the people.

My district is composed of 3 cities and 17 towns and has the usual segments of population in all walks of life and varieties of occupations. The cooperation that has been extended to me by the citizens in accepting the duties of membership on the congressional council is perhaps best illustrated by

a quick break-down of the membership of the council.

Members from the local town and city governments include the 3 mayors and 14 selectmen, 1 from each town. The boards of selectmen of three towns did not accept my invitation to send a representative to the council. The three large labor organizations in my district, the A. F. of L., the CIO, and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, each sent a representative selected by the organization itself and not chosen by me. The same is true of the veterans of World Wars I and II, each group sending a veteran. The chamber of commerce has a representative as does the local association of employers, the nearest approach to the NAM in my district. Farming interests are represented by an editor of the National Grange publication and by a small farmer who is not a member of the Grange. There is also a small-business man and a nonunion workman. The council has one member who is fairly representative of the needs and wants of the old-aged. The high schools have cooperated by sending two seniors who have the point of view of the coming generation. A representative of the fish and game and wildlife conservation interests is also on the council because my district has thousands of people who are outdoor life enthusiasts. There being several institutions of higher learning in the district, the council also has a professor of economics and a professor of government among its membership. Education is also further represented by the presence on the council of the author of the nationally known Springfield plan, which is the local school system's answer to the racial problem. Four of the five large newspapers in the district have sent representatives as have the two radio stations. These representatives are not there in any reportorial capacity but rather from the public service viewpoint. Incidentally, the council's meetings are public and are covered by reporters who are not members. Two representatives from the State legislature, known in Massachusetts as the general court, are also on the council. We also have at least one white-collar office worker, a Federal employee, and three housewives, one of whom is a widow with two small children. I selected the housewives myself because, at least to date, we don't have any organization of housewives, whether that is fortunate or unfortunate. However, I felt it was important to have the viewpoint of women who have to do the buying and run a home on the pay envelope.

I probably have not mentioned all the membership of the congressional council but what I have said should indicate the general make-up. It is a cross-section of my district. I believe that anyone in the district who looks at that congressional council can feel that someone in his walk of life, with his general problems and needs, and with his viewpoint, is on the council.

Geographically, the council includes people from every section of the district; politically, it is divided about equally between Democrats and Republicans. With people of every race, creed, and color, the congressional council is truly an experiment in democracy conducted in the melting pot of the world.

The functions of the congressional council are many and varied and, because there is no precedent for it, we are of necessity proceeding by trial and error method. Probably its primary function is to enable the Congressman to rapidly obtain a cross-section opinion on the effect of legislation upon his district. He knows how legislation will help or hurt because the members of the council, who are representatives of the walks of life from which they come, keep him posted. Of course, he is not bound in any way by their opinions—but he at least knows their opinions and then acts as he himself sees fit, having their opinions in mind.

Secondly, the council knows what is going on. It keeps a constant check on the activities of the Congressman and thus brings the Government closer to the people and the people closer to the Government. I think that is a worth-while goal, especially in a democracy we want to keep. Experience in other parts of the world proves that when the people get away from the government it is not long before the government gets away from the people.

Thirdly, the existence of the council makes it almost impossible for a Congressman to be lobbied without the knowledge of the people of his district—and it insures the Congressman that he will always get all sides of the story. He is sure of that because someone who knows a different side of the problem is on the council, comprised as it is of representatives of manufacturers, farmers, labor, both union and nonunion—small business, landlords, tenants, taxpayers, employers, veterans, education, Federal employees, housewives, town, city, and State officials, old-aged, youth, and so on.

Fourth, the congressional council should be helpful to the district even in noncongressional matters. It brings together in one body all the leading officials of the towns and cities in the district, which should tend toward greater cooperation by the local governments of the district. It also brings into one group many of the outstanding civic leaders and public-spirited citizens of the district, making possible joint action by influential people that should benefit the residents of the district.

Fifth, it provides an ideal sounding board for various nonmember organizations and groups which wish to create a public opinion for or against some project.

Unquestionably, there are, of course, certain disadvantages from the purely personal point of view of a Congressman. The congressional council can be politically dangerous to a Congressman if the members seek to use it for political obstructionism and other partisan tactics. I am confident no one in the group in my district has accepted membership with that aim in mind. However, in my opinion, even the possibility of that happening is unworthy of consideration when weighed against the tremendous good that can be accomplished for the district by a congressional council.

Secondly, let no Congressman adopt the congressional council plan through any desire to ease the burdens of his office. It increases the burden. It will keep a Congressman alert and of necessity make him better informed because the council wants to know more than just a vote. It will also want to know the why and wherefore of that vote.

As one who has not yet earned his spurs in the Halls of Congress, I have been hesitant and reluctant to present this topic to those who have already won respect and admiration for their legislative service. I do so only because of the urgings of those Members to whom I have described the congressional council plan and who feel that it should be brought to the attention of all the Members of the Congress.

I cannot give any proof that a congressional council will succeed admirably or fail miserably in its purposes. I can merely briefly outline its machinery and goals. I repeat that, to the best of my knowledge the plan has never before been tried any place. Consequently, the congressional council in my district is proceeding by trial and error method. There will undoubtedly be changes in its membership, procedure, and functions, as the passage of time proves the need.

The congressional council is purely a voluntary plan, not created by legislation. Strictly speaking, it has no legislative function. Yet I believe that if each Congressman adopted what I have termed the congressional council plan, it would help promote

more good legislation and prevent more bad legislation than anything I can think of. I offer it for the consideration of Members of the Congress.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few minutes to try and enlist the support of Members in connection with a matter that I know is of great interest to all of us and the Nation.

I am hopeful that any Members who feel there may be any merit to my suggestion will communicate with the President.

I think everyone in the Nation has been concerned about cases that have been tried in the Federal courts involving espionage and other matters touching upon the national security. We are all fully aware of the fact that very often certain information should not be made public in court in the interest of national security. We are also aware of the fact that the problem of protecting documents, reports, and other material vital to national security may very easily afford protection to people working against the national security.

We are all also fully aware of the necessity of giving any defendant in a criminal case every possible protection. We are aware of long-established rules of evidence that are intended to give a defendant every possible protection.

We now find ourselves in a situation where the right to security of an individual defendant may well be in conflict with the right to security of over 150,000,000 other people. We have had many cases in court where there was a conflict between the desire to protect an individual at all costs and the desire to protect the security of the Nation at all costs.

Of course, we all fully realize that very often the ultimate goal to security for everyone in the Nation is only reached by protecting the security of the individual. However, there is also the thought that the Constitution may not require the security of the Nation to be sacrificed for the security of one individual.

I do not intend to take the time today to go into the many reasons for the suggestion I am about to make, or to indicate what my own thoughts are on any changes that should or should not be made. I merely want to point out that recent experiences in espionage cases indicate very clearly the need of some revision of existing criminal procedure in such cases where the security of the country is involved. It seems to me that some study should be made of the entire situation. Many of the present rules of law and rules of evidence may need a second look at this time.

I believe the way to approach the situation is not to try and do a piecemeal job, but rather to have a real study of it made. I think the President should appoint a commission, made up of outstanding law professors, trial attorneys, and judges, and other authorities to study the entire problem and to make recommendations.

After the recommendations have been made, I think they should be closely scrutinized by other groups, including people who may have no knowledge of

law but who are interested in protecting individual rights.

I made such a suggestion to the President back in 1949. I do not know whether that is the best way of approaching the problem or not, but I feel such a suggestion should be considered. I hope the Members will also think about it so that, if they agree with me, they may also express themselves to the President. I know the President wants to take every possible step to prevent espionage and to protect our security.

I want it clearly understood that this suggestion is not to be interpreted as meaning that I believe we should immediately change the rules of evidence and that we should abolish every protection that is given to defendants. That is not my thought at all.

The most that should be drawn from the statement I am making today is that I believe there is a very real problem that should be considered by the best legal minds of this Nation. It never hurts to have a study made of any subject and it may do a great deal of good.

We may not all agree on whether or not there should be any changes made in criminal court procedure but we can agree on the fact that, right now, it is far from perfect. Under it, our law-enforcement agencies are often placed in the position of being unable to proceed against persons who are using constitutional safeguards for the purpose of destroying the Nation and the Constitution.

It is not my purpose today to arrive at any conclusion except to point out that an over-all survey by legal experts is very badly needed. I wish to again call the attention of the Members to it before adjournment.

WAYMON H. MASSEY

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 286.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 1025) for the relief of Waymon H. Massey. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the presiding officers of the two Houses in signing said bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following corrections: In line 7 of the House engrossed bill preceding the word "negligence" insert "alleged", and at the end of bill insert "Provided, however, That nothing in this act does or shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSRS. WHITTINGTON, PETERSON, AND PACE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the real compensations coming from service in Congress is the acquaintances made and the friendships formed. Yes, the membership frequently disagrees on political, sectional, and economic problems. Yet when the end of a Congress approaches, we do not think of these differences. We appraise our colleagues at their true worth as friends and patriots, each striving to do that which he believes to be in the best interest of his country.

I have in mind at the moment three Members coming from the deep South who are voluntarily retiring. I refer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

WILL WHITTINGTON announced his retirement preceding the last election but was prevailed upon by his constituents to continue for one more term. The end of that term approaches. It has not been my privilege to ever serve on a committee with any of these gentlemen. Mr. WHITTINGTON, a typical southern gentleman, is an expert in the field of flood control, water transportation, and rivers and harbors legislation. No man in the Congress—yes, I am safe in saying, no man in the country—is more familiar with the problems confronted by the Congress in these fields. He has been a congressional leader down through the years and his sound judgment and initiative have inured in a general way to the best interests of the country. It will be difficult to replace him; however, he is entitled to less work and more leisure in the afternoon of life, and I bespeak for him and his splendid wife all good things possible in the days that are to come.

Everything that I have said about Mr. WHITTINGTON obtains so far as J. HARDIN PETERSON is concerned. He, too, is an expert in the field covered by the Public Lands Committee over which he has so efficiently, satisfactorily, and courteously presided. Regardless of political affiliations, I know of no one in the House who relishes PETE's voluntary retirement. As I understand, he is only retiring from Congress and will enter the active practice of the law associated with his son in the great State of Florida. Many of the Members will accept his invitation and go to Florida to fish and enjoy life when opportunity presents itself—the gentleman from Michigan has already accepted that invitation. The country will be the poorer because Mr. PETERSON has declined to be a candidate for reelection. To know PETE is to love him, and I join with the others in wishing him health, happiness, prosperity, and success in the future.

STEPHEN PACE, of Georgia, is another expert in his field who will not return to the Eighty-second Congress. There is no man in Congress who has a better grasp of the agricultural problems of the Nation than has the gentleman from Georgia. He is a true southern Democrat, but forgets his politics as a member of the Agriculture Committee. He has been the genuine friend and benefactor

of the farmer, whether he grows peanuts, cotton, wheat, corn, potatoes, livestock, or what have you. I would not be exactly fair to myself if I did not say that STEVE never forgets the peanut, tobacco, and cotton farmer, other farm products to the contrary notwithstanding.

When I came to Congress 32 years ago, the most I knew about peanuts was that they were good to eat and were readily purchasable from the peanut roasters in all of our cities and villages in the North. Many others from the North had similar limited knowledge about peanuts. All who have served with STEVE PACE down through the years are pretty well educated concerning the habits, the possibilities, and the place in our economic picture of the lowly peanut. It is going to be some job for any man from the peanut, tobacco, or the cotton areas to fill the big shoes STEVE is leaving in Washington. Time will dim the memory of this genial Member, but his works will live after him. Good luck and happy landing, STEVE.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, very distressing and disturbing news from Camden, N. J., has just been brought to me. Orders have just come from Washington that necessitates the immediate laying off of 2,000 workers in the New York Shipbuilding Co. plant. This follows a layoff of 1,000 last week at the same shipyard. This means that nearly one-half of the skilled shipworkers now employed at this shipyard have been laid off.

The news is distressing to me from the standpoint of the workers who lose their employment. It will undoubtedly create great hardship to the workers and their families. It is also disturbing to me because of what seems a failure on the part of someone in the Government at Washington to fully appreciate the importance of keeping together, at this critical time in our war effort, an efficient and adequate force of skilled shipbuilders. When skilled workers are lost to the shipbuilding industry it means that others less skilled must be found to take their place when the Government enters upon a shipbuilding program. This means delay in construction and added cost to the Government.

Why is it that Government officials permit conditions like this to occur? Is there any doubt that the need exists at the present time for an extensive shipbuilding program? There is no doubt that skilled ship workers will shortly be in great demand if the program of the Maritime Commission is to be carried out. Then, as this will be the case, why create conditions that necessitate laying off 3,000 workers at this time?

This matter is serious. It needs an immediate remedy. Something must be done about it. Foreign nations recognize the importance of ships. Their yards are busy while ours are closing

down. Even Japan has 17 yards busily engaged at this time building ships. All the shipbuilding countries of western Europe are busy. If these nations getting financial help from the United States can build ships to give employment to their workers, then why cannot we do it for our workers? It looks to me that our departments of Government will have to be stirred to action. Maybe the protest strike will be a means of awakening official Washington to the importance of the matter. Certainly, I will make every effort to bring a more realistic program into being.

I repeat, I think it is regrettable that at this critical time in the history of our country, when the necessity exists for a shipbuilding program, that this skilled force of workers should be dismissed. I do hope that by some arrangement by Admiral Cochrane of the Maritime Commission, it will be found possible to put these men back to work and thereby save their skills for the shipbuilding program that is in prospect.

PERSECUTION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], notwithstanding the fact that Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., was pardoned for an offense for which he was convicted, continues to insert in the RECORD misleading statements, designed to show the guilt of Edward A. Rumely.

In addition, the gentleman from Texas has repeatedly from the floor in the past month, but so far as I have been able to learn, not elsewhere where he would not be permitted to claim immunity, charged that Mr. Rumely was guilty of a more serious offense.

This morning there came to my desk from Dorothy G. Pope, assistant secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, the following memorandum and documents.

In justice to Mr. Rumely, to show the situation as it really existed, I now read that memorandum and certain other documents which accompanied it.

MEMORANDUM RE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. EDWARD A. RUMELY, S. WALTER KAUFMANN, NORVIN R. LINDBHEIM

The conviction of Dr. Edward A. Rumely, in 1920, for conspiracy in making an improper report to the Alien Property Custodian, on a prewar indebtedness, was followed by a full and unconditional pardon by the President.

The pardons to Dr. Rumely and to his co-defendants were made by the President in accordance with the recommendation of Attorney General Harlan F. Stone, now Mr. Justice Stone of the Supreme Court of the United States, who, even before his appointment as Attorney General, had written a letter to the President to the effect that in his opinion there was an absence of adequate evidence of criminal intent in the case, that the defendants had been gravely prejudiced upon their trial, and that they were in fact innocent, notwithstanding the judgment of conviction and its affirmance.

Not only did the prosecuting attorney, and the trial judge also, recommend the pardon, but a majority of the jurors signed a petition urging that their verdict be set aside. Many outstanding national leaders joined in commending Dr. Rumely to the President who granted a pardon also to the two attorneys who had prepared the report and who

had been convicted with him. These attorneys were members of a law firm of which the senior partner was the well-known liberal, Arthur Garfield Hays.

The report to the Alien Property Custodian had set forth Dr. Rumely's indebtedness to an American citizen, resident in Germany, but the prosecution claimed that the money was furnished by the German Government. The indebtedness was for money borrowed by Dr. Rumely to purchase stock in a corporation controlling the New York Evening Mail. The trial involved this technical charge.

The report to the Alien Property Custodian was in accordance with his knowledge and belief that the money had been furnished by the individual in question. As pointed out in the opinion of the circuit court of appeals "there was no direct proof" of knowledge that the German Government was the principal in the transaction. Commenting on this point in his afore-mentioned letter to the President, the Honorable Harlan F. Stone wrote:

"Under these circumstances, the suggestion in the judge's charge that 'imputed knowledge' on the part of the defendants was sufficient to justify a conviction and that the jury was not under the necessity of finding actual knowledge on the part of the defendants, was unfortunate and tended to prejudice the rights and interests of the defendants committed to the jury."

The majority of jurors, in their subsequent petition to the President for extreme clemency, themselves admitted that they had given "to the Government the benefit of whatever doubt existed," and that their original verdict was coupled with the recommendation of "extreme mercy" with the thought in mind that the verdict of conviction "would carry with it at most a monetary fine." Within 3 weeks after the conviction 11 of the 12 jurors petitioned the President for "extreme clemency."

The trial was held under the difficulties of war conditions, and, as pointed out in the aforesaid letter of the Hon. Harlan F. Stone, "at the time of the trial, public sentiment was inflamed." Of paramount importance, however, is the fact that certain valuable evidence, withheld from the defendants at the trial, was later brought to attention by the Hon. Charles Nagel who had been a member of President Taft's Cabinet and who was the attorney for one of the most important witnesses in the case.

The majority of the jurors, upon learning of this new evidence, petitioned the President, urging that this verdict be now completely set aside, "since in our judgment this new evidence would have altered our verdict." These jurors pointed out in their petition that the case was of a highly technical and complex nature and, with respect to the newly discovered evidence, that had they had the testimony, the picture that the evidence left with us would have been fundamentally different.

The Hon. Charles Nagel, in presenting the new evidence, stated in a telegram:

"The new facts in my statement which I sought to bring to attention of President are undisputed. They demonstrate it seems to me that defendants had very good reason for making the report to alien property custodian as they did. Whoever may have been responsible at the time there is no practical question now that the withholding of these facts from defendants and from jury at trial resulted in grave miscarriage of justice. Add to this the amazing errors committed in trial all to prejudice of defendants and all disregarded by appellate court for purely technical reasons and it seems to me you have case that presents peculiar grounds for executive intervention. What we need today is old-fashioned American magnanimity."

After the President granted a full and unconditional pardon to all three defendants, the two attorneys brought a proceeding for reinstatement to the bar. The decision in

that case by the New York court of appeals as to the effect of the Presidential pardon was written by the then Chief Justice Cardozo, later Mr. Justice Cardozo of the United States Supreme Court, who pointed out:

"The President in granting this pardon acted in accordance with the recommendation of his Attorney General, now Mr. Justice Stone of the Supreme Court of the United States, who after examining the record expressed a belief that the petitioners were innocent."

Judge Cardozo pointed out further:

"Their prayer was reinforced by lawyers and judges of distinction who asserted * * * an abiding and reasoned distrust of the justice of the verdict."

Judge Cardozo then added:

"A pardon may in some conditions be a warning as significant as a judgment of reversal that the looms of the law have woven a fabric of injustice. The very case at hand is indeed an apposite illustration. The very case at hand is indeed an apposite illustration. The record makes it plain that the pardon was granted because the President of the United States was advised by his Attorney General that the petitioners were innocent. At no time has the circuit court of appeals expressed an opinion to the contrary."

Judge Cardozo concluded his decision with a reminder from Kent's Commentaries that:

"Courts do not forget 'that under the most correct administrations of the law, men will sometimes fall a prey to the vindictiveness of accusers, the inaccuracy of testimony, and the fallibility of jurors.'"

Both the attorneys, having been convicted with Dr. Rumely under the conspiracy charge, were accordingly reinstated to the bar, following the Presidential pardon of all three. In the proceeding brought by the two attorneys for their reinstatement, the court's expressions as to their innocence, are applicable equally to Dr. Rumely, since, as was pointed out by the original trial judge in his charge to the jury, "one defendant alone could not be guilty," and that "a conspiracy is charged as the sole crime and it requires at least two, under the United States law, to form a conspiracy." And, as pointed out in the aforesaid letter of the Honorable Harlan F. Stone, "under the facts of the case which appear on the record, if Kaufmann is innocent, Lindheim must have been also." It therefore follows as a necessary corollary that Rumely "must have been also."

The petition for the attorney's reinstatement was presented to the court by the Honorable William D. Guthrie, who became president of the New York City Bar Association. He characterized the verdict and sentence in this case as "not warranted by the evidence," and that "the result and consequent punishment have constituted a cruel miscarriage of justice."

Mr. Guthrie pointed out that the Association of the Bar of the city of New York on whose application the original orders of disbarment had been entered, then "caused an independent investigation on the merits to be made by its appropriate committees" and thereupon formally certified to the court that it concurred and joined in the petition for reinstatement; and that a number of judges and lawyers, "each of whom had made an examination of the record, certified their several conclusions, to the effect that both the petitioners were innocent and that no evidence was adduced to warrant the conviction of either of them or even the submission of their cases to the jury."

Among the judges and lawyers, referred to as aforesaid, were United States Circuit Judge Julian W. Mack, ex-Presiding Justice Morgan J. O'Brien of the appellate division, first department, former United States Circuit Judge Walter C. Noyes, former justice of the New York Supreme Court Joseph M. Prossauer, Mr. Louis Marshall, member of

the firm of Guggenheimer, Untermeyer & Marshall, Ogden L. Mills, then a member of Congress, Jackson E. Reynolds, and others.

The Honorable Irving Lehman, then associate judge of the New York Court of Appeals, now chief justice of said court, also submitted a personal expression, declaring:

"I think I have made it entirely plain to everyone connected with that case that I am thoroughly convinced of their innocence and more than anxious to see the injustice which I believe has been done to them by a mistaken verdict of the jury righted so far as it can be righted."

The Honorable Morgan J. O'Brien, ex-presiding justice of the appellate division, first department, pointed out that he was "impelled by a sense of justice" to testify.

The Honorable Julian W. Mack, former United States circuit judge, pointed out in his affidavit that he was familiar with the record and that he has never doubted that the verdict of the jury was wrong.

The Honorable Walter C. Noyes, former United States circuit judge, pointed out in his affidavit:

"I made a long and minute examination of the printed record and bill of exceptions and became convinced as a result that there was not sufficient evidence in the case to warrant the court in submitting it to the jury."

The affidavit of Louis Marshall, member of the firm of Guggenheimer, Untermeyer & Marshall, pointed out:

"As a result of the study which I gave to the case, I was not only satisfied that there was legal error * * * but, above all, * * * that the jury was not justified in rendering a verdict of guilty. Further reflection has satisfied me of the correctness of my conclusion, and for that reason I deem it my duty to this court and to the legal profession to join in the request."

Of no less effect was the expression submitted by national leaders urging the Presidential pardon of Dr. Edward A. Rumely.

In a letter to President Coolidge at that time. Col. E. M. House, stated:

"I think it is only fair to Dr. Edward A. Rumely to say that during the war and while he was directing the policy of the New York Evening Mail, he did everything, as far as I recall, to point out the pending food shortage and to suggest practical means for its increase. If there was any disloyal note struck in the Mail while under his direction it failed to come to my notice."

Also in a letter to the President, written by the Reverend James A. Burns, C. S. C., president emeritus of the University of Notre Dame, it was stated:

"I have all along maintained a full conviction of the innocence of Mr. Rumely with respect to the charge upon which he was condemned. I followed the court record in his case so far as possible but saw no grounds in the evidence adduced against him to change this conviction. My lifelong acquaintance with him has led me to regard him as an honorable, high-minded, and patriotic American and I think him altogether incapable of the offense with which he was charged. I saw Mr. Rumely from time to time during the war period, both before he took charge of the New York Mail and after he took charge of it. * * * I never heard the least echo from him of any sentiment which would be inconsistent with the truest patriotic spirit. Mr. Rumely comes of a family which made a distinguished record in the early pioneer days in Indiana, a family whose name became a synonym for honesty and honorable business dealing."

In a letter to the President's secretary, also at that time, by E. G. Liebold, general secretary to Henry Ford, he asserted:

"There has always been a strong feeling in Mr. Ford's mind that certain persons were desirous of making an example of Rumely and compelling him to endure this persecution. The fact that Mr. Ford's name was

largely linked up with him caused us to investigate, the result of which has been that we have been unable to find anything which would equal the crime he is supposed to have committed. * * * During the 15 years or more of his association with the doctor, Mr. Ford has found him to be a man thoroughly honest, of sterling character, and above all, an American citizen of whom this country could feel justly proud, even during the whole period of the war, and notwithstanding the fact that he is of German descent. * * * On behalf of Mr. Ford I am only adding this to the many other communications which I understand likewise speak very highly of Dr. Rumely."

Among such many other communications submitted were letters by Gen. Leonard Wood, then Governor-General of the Philippine Islands; Ben Strong, then Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Hon. Harry S. New, Postmaster General of the United States; Hon. John Weeks, Secretary of War; Gutzon Borglum, the noted sculptor, and many others.

In his letter Gutzon Borglum stated:

"I read the Mail during the entire period of Rumely's ownership, because it was the organ through which Colonel Roosevelt was expressing his war and preparedness policies in which I was interested, and never found anything but the most constructive and helpful attitude toward our national life. I feel that in the interests of justice the President should act to set aside this war verdict."

To the same effect was a letter from Harrington Emerson, president of the Emerson Engineers Efficiency Counselors, that Dr. Rumely was a 100-percent American; that he read the Mail regularly and never saw a disloyal article; and that "he had more vision than any man I ever knew, and although I was older than his father he was an inspiration to me."

S. S. Stratton, president of the Commercial Acceptance Trust, wrote to the President:

"I am strongly of the opinion that the verdict was unjust and would not have been rendered except for the stress of war feeling at that time. * * * I feel that Dr. Rumely and his friends are asking for justice, not mercy."

Commissioner Magnus W. Alexander, of Massachusetts, wrote to the President as "a matter of simple justice":

"Always, so far as my contact with him showed, his purpose was the betterment and strengthening of our country. * * * After an acquaintance with Dr. Rumely for a period of about 15 years, during which time I had frequent opportunity to discuss with him a wide range of public questions and to see his public work bearing upon these questions, as evidenced in his editorial writings and policy in the New York Evening Mail and in other ways, I never found any indication of any national or political interest other than that which focused in the welfare of the United States. Had it been otherwise, the late President Roosevelt would surely not have continued until the last his faith and personal contact with Dr. Rumely."

Corroborative of such "faith and personal contact" of the late President Roosevelt with Dr. Rumely, many letters were submitted, with permission of his widow. One such letter, written by Theodore Roosevelt to the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, stated:

"Dr. Rumely is one of the unhyphenated Americans of German descent who is an American through and through."

Another letter, written privately by Theodore Roosevelt to Dr. Rumely, stated:

"That's a capital letter of yours and I shall read it and the enclosed editorials with the greatest interest. I am genuinely impressed. Can you not come out here some afternoon and let me see you and have a full talk with you—of course a purely confidential talk not for publication."

Other letters by Theodore Roosevelt to Dr. Rumely stated:

"Of course, you are right about the food business, and about the industrial and agricultural plans.

"I feel that I personally owe you much for having given me that comparison of Mexico to the Balkans. Of course, you remember that it was you who did it. Of course, I absolutely agree with you about the agricultural business.

"Those are first class editorials.

"I am really indebted to you for having brought Archbishop Ireland. I thoroughly approve the way you are handling the corporation question.

"I am as usual genuinely obliged to you for what you have done. It is important. By the way, I have already adopted something like what you suggest in the way of taxation."

The effect of these letters were commented upon in a letter to the President by C. E. Holmes, of Westfield, Mass., for Executive clemency, as follows:

"To my mind the most convincing material consists of an extensive correspondence between the doctor and Theodore Roosevelt covering the years 1915-18 when the bias of the editor's mind would most likely have appeared, though none of this material was allowed to be introduced at the trial. They were united by an exceedingly close friendship and Mr. Roosevelt evidently relied upon the doctor as one of his most trusted advisers and used his paper as a valued channel of communication to the public. This correspondence convinces me:

"First, of the most unqualified loyalty of the editor to the ex-President in his prospective campaign of 1916-20. And the latter was anything but pro-German.

"Second, that Mr. Roosevelt had the utmost confidence in the editor as a drafter and interpreter of the outstanding policies of the time.

"Third, that the editor actually rendered most valuable service in working out the policies upon which Mr. Roosevelt hoped to go once more before the country. As his patriotism was unexcelled his absolute confidence in the editor and owner of the Mail should weigh much."

The extent of Colonel Roosevelt's friendship for Dr. Rumely was further the subject of a letter written also by Robert McDowell Allen, formerly an attorney with the Department of Justice in the Theodore Roosevelt administration, to the President, for Executive clemency, to the following effect:

"He was very close to Colonel Roosevelt. He belonged to the trusted few whom that great leader drew to himself—those who mass facts before taking action, who have clear insight into the problem and constructive methods. The country needs to continue to utilize the services of such a man to bring about a better understanding between races and classes and to establish a stronger national unity."

Speaking of Dr. Rumely's operation of the Mail, the same writer stated:

"The Daily Mail became one of my daily afternoon newspapers. The firmness and breadth of its editorial and news policy toward both industrial and civil progress and the constructive methods employed were of the useful kind seldom equaled and never surpassed in American journalism. * * * There is absolutely no doubt in my mind of his loyalty to his country in both fact and deed, from start to finish, and not only is this true, but I believe that the Mail made a substantial contribution both toward the formation and the establishment of the policy and program which mobilized our men and resources for victory."

Corroborative of such policy in Dr. Rumely's operation of the Mail, was a letter by Charles F. Speare, financial editor of the Mail for about 15 years until the end of 1918, and Washington correspondent of the Mail in 1917-18, who wrote to the President:

"I am very pleased to state that at no time, either in connection with my work in Wall Street or in Washington, did Dr. Rumely suggest or try to influence me in anything that I wrote, either on financial subjects or on business or national questions."

To the same effect was the letter written to the President by I. K. Russell, chief news writer on the Mail, as follows:

"I know Rumely only as my employer. I have no social fellowship with him but I want to feel that our country drives right in its thrusts for punishment. * * *

"I received orders every day from Dr. Rumely through all the period during which he was under suspicion. I brought an enormous amount of anti-German news to him, for decision as to whether we should print it. The decision in every case was 'print.' I do not believe I could look a man in the eye every day for 2 or 3 years and not know whether his heart was true or not. And I am compelled to say that in every act in which I contacted him as the chief news writer on his paper during his Evening Mail publishership, he so behaved that I am convinced it would be utterly impossible for him to have been consciously beholden to the German Imperial Government. In American affairs he was a devoted Progressive. * * * In that time America had no publicist so ardent for preparedness as Dr. Rumely; I know as the man assigned to write scores and hundreds of articles for that cause."

To the same effect was a letter written by a nonemployee, the Reverend John A. Ryan, D. D., director of the department of social action of the National Catholic Welfare Council:

"I will say that I saw the New York Evening Mail pretty regularly during the first 7 months of the year 1918, and that I never found anything in the paper that was disloyal or likely to hamper the war activities and purposes of the United States. Indeed, I had two personal experiences of the contrary tendency in the policy of the paper's management. Two articles which I sent in were rejected on the ground that they might be regarded as critical of the national administration, and of the war policies of Great Britain. The first was a discussion of the Nonpartisan League of North Dakota; the second dealt with the issue of conscription in Ireland, and was somewhat severe upon Lloyd George. A journal which objected to these two articles could not, under the most extreme construction of loyalty, be fairly deemed disloyal."

Dr. Rumely's activities other than as publisher of the Mail were the subject of a submitted letter, written at that time by Leigh M. Griffith, technical expert for the National Advisory Committee, who wrote to Dr. Rumely:

"I believe that this committee fully appreciates the importance of the early development and the ultimate possibilities of the engine of this type and your patriotic interest in working to this end is greatly appreciated."

Equally favorable references were made in other letters as to Dr. Rumely's contribution in the field of education.

In conclusion, S. S. McClure, a close associate of Dr. Rumely in his operation of the Mail, wrote generally to the President at that time:

"He was always in his approach to American questions and in his conduct of the paper wholeheartedly American. From my most intimate association with Dr. Rumely during the entire period in question, I know, as far as it is humanly possible for one man to know another's mind, that the state-

ments that he made to the Government in connection with the Mail were those that he himself believed to be true. I would not write you, I would not make these statements to you except that I want to prevent as far as I can a great wrong being done to a very lovable, splendid, and innocent man."

The full and unconditional pardon was granted by the President on January 19, 1925, 9 months after the defendants had already served their sentence of 30 days in the penitentiary under the President's earlier commutation of sentence. The Attorney General, in his official report recommending such pardon, pointed out that their exceptional high character warranted such pardon at that time without waiting the customary requisite lapse of years otherwise prescribed. The pardon proceedings are on file with the Department of Justice in Washington, D. C. A certified copy of the pardon is on file with the record of the case in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

Thus, the President of the United States did not forget just as Mr. Justice Cardozo did not forget, that: "Under the most correct administrations of the law, men will sometimes fall a prey to the vindictiveness of accusers, the inaccuracy of testimony, and the fallibility of jurors."

In conclusion, the warning of Mr. Justice Cardozo is here reiterated, that:

"A pardon may in some conditions be a warning as significant as a judgment of reversal that the looms of the law have woven a fabric of injustice. The very case at hand is indeed an apposite illustration."

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, PARDON DIVISION (JAMES A. FINCH, PARDON ATTORNEY)

(Pardon attorney—exhibit No. 14, (p. 403))

LIST OF PARDONS, COMMUTATIONS, AND RESPITES GRANTED BY THE PRESIDENT DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1925

Name of applicant: Norvin R. Lindheim, S. Walter Kaufman, and Edward A. Rumely
XXX-XX-XXXX

District and offense: New York, southern. Conspiracy to defraud the United States and conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States in violation of section 37, C. C. U. S. and sections 7 and 16 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Sentence and date: December 20, 1920. Each, 1 year and 1 day in the Atlantic Penitentiary. (Judgment affirmed.)

Recommendation of Attorney General: On March 13, 1924, President Coolidge commuted the sentences of all three petitioners to 1 year in the Westchester County Penitentiary at White Plains, N. Y., and on April 11, 1924, again commuted the sentences to 1 month in the same penitentiary. Petitioners served their terms as commuted and were released on April 18, 1924. It developed during the investigation of this case that the applicants were all men of high character and uniformly so regarded. The Attorney General advised that they be granted full and unconditional pardons to restore their civil rights.

Action of President and date: January 19, 1925. Pardon granted to restore civil rights.

NEW YORK, September 18, 1916.

CHARLES E. HUGHES, Esq.,
Republican National Headquarters,
New York City.

MY DEAR MR. HUGHES: This will introduce to you Dr. Edward A. Rumely, who is supporting you very strongly in the editorial columns of the Evening Mail. Dr. Rumely is one of the unhyphenated Americans of German descent who is an American through and through.

He is an expert in the processes, especially the industrial processes, which has

given the Germanic Empire its extraordinary strength; and he has been peculiarly useful to me in connection with matters looking to a better handling of America's industrial and social life.

With high regards, I am,
Faithfully yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

NAGEL, KIRBY, ORRICK & SHEPLEY,
St. Louis, October 26, 1927.

JOHN R. MONTGOMERY, Esq.,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. MONTGOMERY: I was detained in the East longer than I had expected; but I have now looked up my files and am prepared to give you what information I can about the question which arose in Dr. Rumely's case, and which you now have particularly in mind.

The fact is that I had known Dr. Rumely for some years, and while he was more of a progressive than I could bring myself to be, we nevertheless discussed a good many questions very frankly and unreservedly. During the early stages of the war I saw him very rarely, because for a period of several years I did not go to New York at all. When I did see him later on he discussed the policy of his newspaper, the Mail, with great freedom, and I gathered that such men as ex-President Roosevelt were entirely conversant with his attitude. So much for the general picture.

Some time later it was suggested to me in my office that Mrs. Busch might be interested in the Mail, and inasmuch as the paper was in financial difficulty, it might be my duty as her counsel to make my inquiries. I went to New York and investigated the matter as closely as I could, leaving with the impression that Mr. Sielckin was very substantially interested in the paper in connection with Dr. Rumely, and that while Mrs. Busch might be interested, there were no facts or suggestions presented to me that in my opinion were sufficiently substantial to justify my stepping into the case without direct orders from her, which, of course, she was in no position to give, owing to her absence in Germany. She was then a very old lady, and had remained on the other side expecting, as most people did, that the war would not last long, and that she might be spared the inconvenience and danger of an ocean trip under war conditions.

In the meantime, I had represented Mrs. Lilly Busch in her claim to have her property returned to the Allen Property Custodian. In that connection I had advised the authorities of everything I knew, and, indeed, appeared before the grand jury in New York to give them such information as I had. Mrs. Busch returned in 1918, and in my first interview in answer to my question, she told me that she had never been interested in the Mail. She told me also that Mr. Sielckin, in 1916, had called on her and told her that he was interested in a newspaper in this country, and had invited her to join in the undertaking. It is my impression that Mrs. Busch at a later interview told me that she had again heard from Mr. Sielckin but had not acknowledged his letter, hoping to have another opportunity to see him, which was, however, prevented because of his continued very serious illness.

All this information I gave to the United States district attorney in New York before the case against Dr. Rumely and others was tried. I felt at liberty to do so because the information had come to me while I represented Mrs. Busch in her effort to regain her property, in which she ultimately succeeded. I wanted very much to give the same information to the defendants, because it seemed to me to be probably controlling in the case. Mrs. Busch was not called as a witness, but was permitted to make a statement in writing, which merely recited the fact that she had never been interested in

the paper, but which was silent as to Mr. Sielckin's interest. I considered the question very seriously, conferred with my partners about it, and we concluded that inasmuch as the information had come to me in my capacity as counsel, I had no right to divulge it unless and until I was released by my client. That release I could not at the time obtain.

After the defendants had been found guilty and efforts were being made for a new trial, a certain document was submitted to me which indicated that Mr. Sielckin (who by the way was an American citizen abroad) during the war had given a power of attorney in connection with the New York Mail, to the firm of Hays, Kauffman & Lindheim. In connection with these documents the possible interest of Mrs. Busch was referred to. I felt that in view of this state of facts Mrs. Busch ought to speak in justice to herself and to the defendants, and this she concluded to do.

I enclose for your information an affidavit made by her at the time, which confirms what I am now saying to you, and which practically contains the essential information upon which I have relied.

When the application for pardon was submitted to the President, I sent him a statement upon the same lines which I have now submitted to you and, as you know, the pardon was granted.

It has always been difficult for me to reconcile my own conduct. Professionally, I think I was right. In every other sense it has been the source of the most profound regret. I had given the information to the authorities and, to be entirely frank, I think it was the plain duty of the prosecutor to have that information brought to the attention of the court. Perhaps he assumed that the defendants had the same information and for their own reasons did not use it. That, however, I now know not to have been the fact. The defendants did not know that this information was to be had, and were convicted without the use of evidence to which in my judgment they were clearly entitled.

If there is any other information that I can give, I shall be glad to supply it. In closing, I say that I have always believed that Dr. Rumely made his statement in strict conformity with his own information at the time, and my relation to him since then can be reconciled only with my entire conviction of his innocence at the time.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES NAGEL.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
December 15, 1943.

Pursuant to title 28, section 661, United States Code (sec. 862, Revised Statutes), I hereby certify that the annexed paper is a true copy of the original record in the Department, of the pardon to restore civil rights of Edward A. Rumely granted by President Coolidge on January 19, 1925.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the Department of Justice to be affixed, on the day and year first above written.

JAMES P. McGRANERY,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States of America;

To all to whom these presents shall come,
Greeting:

Whereas Edward A. Rumely was convicted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York upon two counts of an indictment, charging respectively conspiracy to defraud the United States and conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States, in violation of section 37 of the Criminal Code and sections 7 and 16 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and on December 20, 1920, he was sen-

tenced to imprisonment for 1 year and 1 day in the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., which judgment was affirmed by the Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit; and

Whereas several respites were granted by me to the said Edward A. Rumely, and on March 13, 1924, his sentence was commuted to imprisonment for 1 year in the Westchester County Penitentiary, White Plains, N. Y., and on April 11, 1924, a second commutation was granted reducing the imprisonment to 1 month; and

Whereas it has been made to appear to me that the said Edward A. Rumely is a fit object of further clemency:

Now, therefore, be it known, that I, Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States of America, in consideration of the premises, divers other good and sufficient reasons me thereunto moving, do hereby grant unto the said Edward A. Rumely a full and unconditional pardon, for the purpose of restoring his civil rights.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto signed my name and caused the seal of the Department of Justice to be affixed.

Done in the District of Columbia this 19th day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-ninth.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

By the President:

HARLAN F. STONE,
Attorney General.

Apparently the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is attempting to manufacture campaign material for the CIO. Apparently the gentleman's efforts are directed in support of a program to silence all those who have opposed the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and their political fallacies.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE PRESENT POLICY OF SPENDING AS USUAL MUST COME TO A STOP—NON-DEFENSE EXPENDITURES SHOULD BE CUT TO THE BONE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, within the last few weeks the Congress has approved appropriations of \$59,500,000,000 to finance the Federal Government for the year beginning July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951. It is the biggest appropriation of any year in the history of our country.

This means that every man, woman, and child in the United States, if he pays his share, owes the Federal Government \$400 for carrying on the expenses of Federal activities just for 1 year. Put it another way. Every family would be charged with a tax of \$27 per week just to carry on the expenses of your Government and mine.

Approximately \$32,000,000,000 of this amount is for the defense of our country. The remainder, \$27,000,000,000, is for nondefense items, of which \$6,000,000,000 is in fixed charges, such as the interest on the public debt, which today amounts to the astronomical figure of \$267,000,000,000. It is estimated by Treasury officials that the revenue for the year will be approximately \$37,000,000,000, leaving a deficit of \$22,000,000,000 more to be added to the Federal debt.

To the average citizen these are merely figures of such gigantic proportions that a billion dollars more or less makes little difference. Of course, all necessary expenditures for defense purposes must

be taken care of, but nondefense spending is bound to result in greater inflation, and the average person, especially the wage earner and his family, will recognize the additional billions in the increased prices for necessities of life.

I cannot too strongly stress the necessity of keeping the economy of our country sound. It is a matter that affects every man, woman, and child throughout our broad land. I would like to add right here that the aim of communism is to weaken our country. I should further add that our economy becomes weaker when we spend taxpayers' money for activities not absolutely needed, and thereby inadvertently and indirectly contribute to such weakness.

The Bureau of the Budget, which is the adviser of the President relating to the expenditure of funds, has the power, at the direction of the President, to impound any portion of such funds when expenditures are not advisable.

When the appropriation bills were under consideration in the House, I objected strenuously to the spending of money not required for our defense program and not necessary to carry on our civilian activities. It is my view that out of the \$27,000,000,000 for nondefense appropriations, at least 25 percent, or \$8,000,000,000, can be saved by the executive branch.

I voted against a number of "pork barrel" projects that I deemed unnecessary in a national emergency. This money should not be expended, especially now.

For example, the Senate increased swollen "pork barrel" projects in the House bill by \$135,000,000. There are a number of unnecessary items of expenditures that make up millions of dollars. For example, there is an item of \$286,000 for visitors' facilities and an exhibition building at Shasta Dam, Calif. This is just one of a hundred items that are certainly nonessential at the present time.

That part of the \$60,000,000,000 for nondefense spending is based upon past records of Government expenditures. Here are some of the additional items: \$335,000,000 for travel and subsistence for Federal employees in nondefense activities. I know that a great deal of expense is required for necessary travel of people in Government. Look at that figure for a moment. On this basis, every one of the 2,000,000 Federal employees could go by pullman from Washington to Denver, spend 2 days with all expenses paid, and return to Washington. Certainly this item could be materially reduced.

Activities can be reduced in nondefense agencies so that thousands of employees may be released and transferred to defense agencies, and thereby save at least two or three hundred million dollars.

Our Government spends \$10,000,000 a year for the purchase of gasoline, tires, parts, and maintenance of 26,000 automobiles owned by nonmilitary agencies of Government. There are several hundred in Washington. Of course, the Government agencies need automobiles, but surely not 26,000. This big expense could be reduced materially and relieve to some extent the taxpayers' load.

I am sure that people of our country are willing to support the defense of our country, but they do not want it wasted, for example, on such purposes as paying personnel to run propaganda machines for Government agencies. Recent congressional investigations reported 40,000 employees being paid \$75,000,000 a year to tell the public how good the Federal agencies are. This is just another example of unnecessary expenditure and unnecessary use of manpower.

I have supported reorganization proposals designed to carry out the Hoover Commission recommendations where funds could be saved. The Commission has stated that if its recommendations were made effective, they would save approximately \$3,500,000,000. It appears, however, that as fast as Congress puts the Hoover Commission recommendations into effect, some other device is found to spend taxpayers' money needlessly.

Past mistakes of the administration in handling military and foreign policy matters are no excuse for future conduct in dealing with these problems. Certainly, we cannot excuse excessive and nonessential government spending on the ground that our Government is too large to be controlled. The American people have been kept in a state of perpetual emergency for the past 20 years. If our children are to live to enjoy the fruits of our labors and our attempts to secure peace and world prosperity, we must begin to preserve our national economy from destruction from within as well as from aggressors outside our borders.

It is clear that Communist forces at large in the world are intent upon destroying our way of life. To destroy the economy of this country will lead in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in strenuous times. Our representative form of government is on trial. In order to remain strong from within, it is necessary that we cut every nonessential expenditure to the very limit. People of this country will have to quit making unnecessary demands upon the Federal Treasury, and the same thing goes for the various municipalities and groups who are seeking appropriations and authorizations from the Federal Treasury. Mr. Speaker, the present policy of spending as usual must come to a stop.

Each and every nondefense item must be weighed in the balance as to whether such expenditure is absolutely needed in view of the national and international situation. Every item of Federal expenditure must be cut to the bone so we may have funds to support the boys now fighting in Korea and boys who will soon go to other parts of the world in defense of freedom and liberty.

Mr. Speaker, these are not normal times. They are serious times. The grim fact is that our representative government is being put to the supreme test. The gruesome part of the burden must be carried by the young men in the Armies, Navies, Marines, and Air Forces we send abroad. Certainly it is not too much to ask the present generation to work a little harder and cast aside its luxuries. We should be willing to make sure the

economic sacrifices that are needed for the preservation of our Nation and the freedom and liberty which are our heritage are not destroyed.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

RUMELY, BRAINS AND SPEARHEAD OF THE MOST VICIOUS LOBBY IN THE UNITED STATES, TRYING TO DECEIVE CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE ABOUT HIS SPYING AND DISLOYAL RECORD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee for Constitutional Government that was organized by and operated for 13 years by E. A. Rumely is the best-financed and most powerful lobby in the United States. Rumely gets his funds from wealthy individuals and corporations by promising that such payments and contributions are tax-free. In this way he has diverted millions of dollars from the Treasury to himself for partisan political purposes. The Federal deficit is made larger at a time when Rumely is abusing the Government officials for operating on a deficit.

Rumely is not the right kind of a person to have charge of a propaganda campaign to control the thoughts and views of the people. He was convicted for trading with the enemy during World War I and the evidence in that case discloses that he was guilty of treason. A record of his case can be found in most any law library. The reference is 293 Federal Reporter 532.

MISLEADING AND UNTRUE INFORMATION

There have been certain statements made on the floor of this House in regard to a pardon that President Coolidge granted this fraud, Rumely, for the crime of failing to report that he was running a newspaper with German Government money when we were at war with that country. There also have been statements made on the floor and insertions put in the RECORD about an alleged suppression of evidence by the Government—some making this charge directly and others by strong implication. Finally, the claim is made that Rumely was given his pardon because of the so-called suppression of evidence.

Now, I do not believe that my Republican colleagues would purposely mislead the House nor do I think that they want to mislead the House. I do not think that they are familiar with the facts of his conviction or his pardon or they would join me in exposing him for what he was and what he is—a fraud, pure and simple. Yes, Rumely even succeeded in deceiving my Republican colleagues about the circumstances and the reasons for his pardon. For instance, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], speaking in Rumely's defense when he was cited for contempt of this House on August 30, had this to say:

But it was not long after he was convicted in World War I, as a result of borrowing money from an American citizen to buy a New York newspaper, that it developed

evidence which would have cleared him had been suppressed by the Government. Eleven of the twelve members of the jury, when they found out the purport of the evidence which had been suppressed, signed a petition to the Attorney General of the United States—a man named Harlan F. Stone—who, after carefully studying and reviewing the case, requested the then President of the United States, another New England man, Calvin Coolidge, to pardon Rumely.

He was not only given full pardon but also restored completely to citizenship.

See page 13892 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On September 18, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] at page 15058 of the RECORD had this to say:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman's statement is not accurate. Innocent individuals who were unjustly convicted have been pardoned, such was the case of Mr. Rumely and it was so found by the President.

The gentleman from Michigan also had a statement in defense of Rumely by Robert B. Dresser, Republican national committeeman from Rhode Island, put in the RECORD at page 15066. At page 15067 the following appears:

Within 3 weeks after the conviction, 11 of the 12 jurors recommended executive clemency. Thereafter, the majority of the surviving 11 jurors stated that at the time of the trial "it was our disposition to give to the Government the benefit of whatever doubt existed" and that they had expected that the conviction, with their recommendation of extreme mercy, would carry at most a monetary fine. They further stated that had the jury had the evidence which was withheld from the defendants at the time of trial, but which was later brought to their attention by the Honorable Charles Nagel, who was Secretary of Commerce under President Taft and attorney for the witnesses whose testimony was withheld, they would have reached a different verdict. The petition of these jurors to the President concluded with the following: "Since in our judgment this new evidence would have altered our verdict or resulted in a disagreement, we therefore respectfully recommend that by the exercise of executive clemency this verdict be now completely set aside."

Both the prosecuting attorney and the trial judge joined in recommending a pardon.

The President, following the request of the jurors that their verdict be set aside, and the supporting recommendations by outstanding national leaders, among them Cabinet members and judges, granted a full and unconditional pardon to all three.

On September 19, at page 15139, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] stated:

Again, as on previous occasions, I call to his attention and to the attention of the Members of the House a statement of the law to the effect that a pardon in this case was granted because the man was innocent should in the mind of any fair man, prevent a repetition of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Now some of these remarks are absolutely inaccurate and the others are misleading.

First, Did the Government suppress evidence? No. The Government had nothing to do with any suppression of evidence and no evidence was suppressed by anyone. The fact of the matter is that Charles Nagel, a man friendly with the defendants, did not come forward and tell them of a conversation he had with his client, Mrs. Busch, one of those

Rumely claimed had furnished him money to buy the Mail. The conversation was merely that she had been approached regarding a possible investment in a newspaper. This does not change the essential fact that she did not invest in the paper as Rumely claimed and that the money in fact was furnished by the German Imperial Government. Incidentally, the so-called evidence, even if volunteered by Nagel at the trial, would have been hearsay evidence and therefore legally incompetent. The important thing, however, is that the claim is repeatedly made, directly or by implication, that the Government suppressed evidence. The charge is completely false.

Second. The second claim made by my Republican colleagues is that Rumely was really innocent and that his pardon resulted from the disclosure of Nagel's evidence. Actually, Rumely was guilty as sin, and his pardon was not a result of disclosure of evidence or a belief in his innocence.

What are the facts? At the time of Rumely's pardon, President Coolidge was pardoning many people convicted of political and quasi-political crimes that were committed against the United States during the war. It was his policy to do so. A pardon does not mean that a person is innocent, merely that he has been excused and restored to his former status.

As for Rumely's own case, there is nothing in the proceedings leading up to his pardon to indicate that he was pardoned because it was thought that if the evidence which Rumely now alleges was suppressed by the Government—and which I have indicated was not—had been brought forward he would have been found innocent. The reason assigned for the pardon of Rumely and his codefendants may be found in the report of the Attorney General for the fiscal year 1925 at page 403. It states:

It developed during the investigation of this case that the applicants were all men of high character and uniformly so regarded. The Attorney General advised that they be granted full and unconditional pardons to restore their civil rights.

I think the House should learn the nature of Rumely's pardon. It was a pardon granted to restore his civil rights. It did not mean that he was unjustly convicted. It was not thought that Nagel's testimony would have made any difference. He was just pardoned as were many others. In my statement before the House on yesterday, I discussed the effect of an Executive pardon. This part of my speech is on page 15338 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, September 20. I also inserted a statement from the Library of Congress, which is very interesting. To prove to the House that the Department of Justice was not impressed with Nagel's disclosure, I am going to point out certain important dates.

Rumely was not pardoned until January 19, 1925. He began to serve his sentence in March of 1924. He served time until April 18, 1924. Nagel obtained his release to speak as early as December

1921. By November of 1923 Rumely was able to induce some of the jurors to sign his prepared statement. Remember that Rumely started to serve in 1924 and was not pardoned until 1925, almost a year after his release. Now, I submit to this House that if Nagel's disclosure convinced anyone that Rumely was innocent and that he was pardoned as a result thereof, it would not have taken from December 1921 until January 1925. And even more persuasive is the fact that the Department of Justice and the President, having this information along with the ready-made statement signed by some of the jurors, allowed Rumely to serve time in jail. If these things convinced the President and the Attorney General of Rumely's innocence and if he were pardoned because it was thought he was innocent, he would have been pardoned before he served time. They had the facts before he served time. I submit to this House that the phony argument about his innocence and pardon is just another thread in Rumely's fabric of lies.

Let us examine Dresser's phony claim to the jury's position about guilt or innocence a little closer. Even if the jurors recommended clemency it does not mean they were of the belief that Rumely was innocent although his defenders would like us to believe it.

This petition of some of the jurors regarding Nagel's disclosure was a prepared one. No juror wrote it. They might have been disposed to sign it since it was then 3 years after the trial. Notice the language "altered our verdict or resulted in a disagreement." The ones that signed could have been convinced that one of their fellow jurors might not have voted for conviction. Note that not one of the jurors said that he individually would have voted for Rumely's acquittal. Note, too, that this was executed at a time when it was the disposition of the country to forgive our enemies and our traitors.

Moreover, Rumely and his defenders have neglected to state that some of the jurors were a bit strong-minded and saw through the subterfuge. They insisted on stating that it was only insofar as any prison sentence or loss of citizenship was concerned. In other words, they were still convinced of his guilt and insisted on saying so even though they were willing to go along with the prevailing policy of forgiveness.

I repeat that this pardon business is phony. It is only more evidence that Ed Rumely is a fraud today. He was guilty in World War I and he is trying to deceive the country now. We may forgive a dog for biting us, but we should be wary of it in the future.

CLEMENCY ACTION—RUMELY CASE

November 9, 1923: Respite of 60 days granted.

January 5, 1924: Further respite of 60 days granted.

March 13, 1924: Sentence commuted to 1 year in the Westchester County Penitentiary, White Plains, N. Y.

April 11, 1924: Sentence commuted to the period of 1 month.

April 18, 1924: Released.

January 19, 1925: Pardon granted to restore civil rights.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CREATING SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGED PRACTICES IN THE SALE OF CHILDREN

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution which, if adopted, would create a select committee with powers to conduct an investigation and study of the alleged practices in the sale of children by institutions charged with their care. I introduced this resolution because it is not confined to any one State but goes into interstate commerce and, according to the FBI, they have no authority to investigate the matter.

I regret that the great volunteer State of Tennessee is receiving so much unfavorable publicity because of the alleged "racket" directed at the head of the Memphis branch of the Tennessee Children's Home Society, concerning the acceptance of money for children, many of whom have not been legally adopted through court decrees.

According to newspaper articles, more than 1,000 babies have probably been involved in illegal adoption proceedings, manipulated through the Memphis branch of the Tennessee Children's Home Society, and exported in interstate traffic mostly to the States of New York and California. It is alleged that this practice has been going on for 20 years.

According to newspaper information, reports received by State officials show that where transportation costs of adoption amounted to no more than \$100, foster parents were charged \$750. Many heart-rending stories have been printed concerning the purchase of babies from the Memphis institution.

It has now come to light, that many of the true parents of infants who were left in the care of the Memphis Society, are now asking that their children be returned and, upon investigation, have learned that their children have been, heretofore, in some cases, adopted under the laws of the State of Tennessee, but, in numerous other cases, have been assigned to new homes in violation of the State laws relating to the adoption of children.

In fact, it is believed that in many instances no legal procedure of any kind has been instituted.

A Hayti, Mo., father and World War II veteran, according to newspaper reports, recently issued a statement in Memphis saying that Miss Tan, who, until her death on last Sunday, September 15, was the head of the Memphis branch of the Tennessee Children's Home Society, had hoodwinked him into signing papers authorizing placement of his three children for adoption.

Other stories appearing in the press were from Edward Russell, a father, 31 years of age, stating that he had not seen his children since December 7, 1949, when they were turned over to Miss Tan. He stated that he believed that he would have them back as soon as he had procured employment. Russell admitted that he had signed adoption papers, but stated that the matter was misrepresented to him by Miss Tan.

According to reports from certain investigations, high profits, in the baby-adoption racket, through collection of excess traveling expenses, have been made. One of the stories appearing in the paper was to the effect that a woman from Pasadena, Calif., wrote to the head of the Memphis institution that she and her husband had paid \$187 for a baby they never received. The money reportedly represented one-half of the investigator's traveling expenses. The California woman stated that her home was approved and highly praised by the children's home investigator, but that they were surprised when informed that they would have to pay an additional amount of about \$400. When the baby failed to arrive, she wrote the late head of the Memphis society, but was informed that her application had been canceled, but the \$187 was never returned.

Many other heart-rending stories have been printed regarding the proposed baby traffic, which, of course, would and should be thoroughly investigated if my resolution is adopted.

According to the press, it is estimated that between 90 and 95 percent of the babies who have been placed by the Memphis home have been sent to California and New York. According to information reaching me, there is a shortage of babies available for adoption in the State of Tennessee, and since children are apparently being designated to out of the State foster parents in wholesale numbers, this is a matter that directs itself to the Federal Government, since it involves interstate traffic, and I know that the members of this Body will agree that it is high time that a thorough and far-reaching investigation be made.

Many of the stories appearing in the press are heartbreaking indeed. I have had occasion to discuss the matter with the law-enforcement agencies of the Federal Government and to make a hurried search of the Federal laws, and was astounded to learn that there is nothing that can be done to prohibit such practice under the laws now in force and effect.

I am, of course, humiliated that this racket would be directed to my home State. Hence, I hope that the Members of Congress will lend their whole-hearted assistance to me in procuring the passage of this resolution immediately, in order that such a terrible practice may be forever eliminated. The penalty should and must be severe, and I know that if a congressional investigation should prove that a racket of the type that is being described in the papers, is being permitted to exist in the United States, that the good mothers and fathers of this Nation will be elated to know that the strong arm of the Federal Government has moved into the picture and will apprehend and imprison those who are guilty of such frauds, and who go to such inhuman extent in their lust for gold.

Of course, the entire population of this Nation is gravely concerned over reports of this kind, and I am happy to say that the authorities of my home State of Tennessee have expressed great concern over the matter. I am informed that the Governor will recom-

mend that the laws of the State of Tennessee be amended to such an extent that persons in whose care infants have been placed, who reside in Tennessee, will be slow indeed to take a chance on violating the laws relating to adoption, provided that they can have the cooperation of the Federal Government in cases involving interstate adoption, or where the laws of the State of Tennessee could not be enforced.

I understand that recently some investigators representing the State of Tennessee and who are, at this time, investigating the alleged baby black market, contend that it is probable that within the last 10 years that the returns from this illegal practice has returned the participants a million dollars or more. Reportedly, the former head of the Memphis society owned considerable real-estate holdings, including a hotel on the west coast, a tourist home, her Memphis residence, and a duplex, also situated in the city of Memphis.

Certainly there are many, many signs of fraud in connection with this racket, and I sincerely hope that the Congress will concur with me that a congressional committee should investigate such charges and allegations, then recommend to the Congress laws to do away with such unbelievable racketeering practices.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a resolution and other extraneous matter.)

ATLANTA CITY SCHOOLS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a suit was filed in the United States District Court in Atlanta on September 19, 1950, in behalf of certain Negro children against Miss Ira Jarrell, superintendent of the Atlanta city schools, and the members of the city board of education.

I am informed that the suit alleges in substance that Negro children can only secure equal educational opportunities with white children by being allowed to attend school with white children.

This suit removes any doubt which previously existed, if any did exist, that the real objective of the Negro agitators is social equality and is not to obtain fair treatment in educational opportunities.

The Negroes of Georgia, and particularly those in the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, have for a long time been accorded educational advantages, paid for almost entirely by white people, far superior to those which they have earned, or which they have shown themselves to be entitled through their own efforts.

The white people of Georgia, and of my district and county, have carried this burden, and have carried it uncompactly. It has been well known that the Negroes could not and would not provide educational facilities through their own efforts. Had their school opportunities and facilities been limited to such as their own taxes would have paid for, it is doubtful if provision could have

been made for Negro children as a whole to finish the first grade.

I will give you an illustration of the situation to which I refer: In my home county of De Kalb in the State of Georgia, 2,042 Negro children are enrolled in the county public school system.

Negro property owners in De Kalb County pay school tax upon 1,348 parcels of real estate, total valuation \$357,320; net valuation after deducting the homestead exemptions, \$77,600. Negro property owners pay taxes upon 842 items of personal property, gross valuation \$77,950; net valuation after homestead exemption, \$50,750. These property owners thus pay school tax upon \$128,350 of taxable property. Our school tax rate is 15 mills, or \$1.50 per \$100.

The total amount of school taxes paid by these property-owning Negroes is \$1,925.35.

The county operates four Negro school busses to haul Negro children to the county public schools at an annual expense of \$2,000 each, or a total for school bus expenses of \$8,000.

The total school taxes paid by the Negroes of De Kalb County into the county school system is less than one-fourth the actual money spent by the county to haul them to the schoolhouses.

Our county spends per child per year for school purposes an average of \$85.33 per child enrolled. If the white taxpayers did not pay these school expenses for Negro children, the \$1,925.35 would provide less than \$1 per school year for the 2,042 Negro children who attend the county public schools.

I said a moment ago that the school tax money paid by Negroes would carry them no further than the first grade. That was a mistake. If that were all the money they had for their children's educational facilities, it would not begin to be enough to carry them through the first grade. It would hardly carry them through the first four letters of the alphabet.

Another fact shown by the school tax figures is that on ad valorem property taxes paid by white people in that county the homestead exemption amounts to 40 percent of the taxable value of the property involved, while the homestead exemption on the Negro-owned property is 70 percent of the taxable value of the property, and thus on Negro-owned property, taxes are collected only upon 30 percent of the tax valuation of such property, in the aggregate.

The charge by Negro agitators, as well as white agitators, that Negroes and Negro children do not receive fair or just treatment from an educational standpoint is the veriest tommyrot. Upon a recent visit home I inspected a newly constructed Negro grammar school and a newly constructed Negro school gymnasium, and found them to be the equal of any white school or gymnasium in the district, and superior to many white schools and gymnasiums in the district.

We would not hear this agitation at all about Negro schools or about abolition of segregation in schools, on trains, in the Army, and elsewhere were it not for a vile political scheme between President Truman, his civil-rights agitators, the Supreme Court of the United States, and the National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People, through which the present national leadership of the Democratic Party, with the connivance of the Supreme Court as it is presently constituted, are pandering to the Negroes for political support by destroying segregation through judicial legislation. Congress has consistently refused throughout the years to pass laws destroying segregation, and this vile scheme has been devised to circumvent the will of the people as expressed by their representatives in Congress.

The fact that a majority of the present nine men composing the personnel of the Supreme Court, most of whom are purely political appointees, have decided to overrule the law of the land, and to undertake to force their own personal views upon the people of the country through the makeshift subterfuge of a judicial decision, does not make such action either constitutional or acceptable.

The power to change the law of the land rests in the legislative department. It does not rest in the judicial department.

The present Supreme Court has been grossly guilty of attempting to change the laws of this land by what amounts to nothing more nor less than judicial legislation. Such action is reprehensible. It is as much a violation of the Constitution as it would be for the Congress to undertake to render legal decisions in place of the Supreme Court, or to act as Commander in Chief of the Army in place of the President.

I made a speech on this subject in the House of Representatives on August 15, 1949. At that time I said with reference to these attempts to legislate judicially:

It is time for the bar of the Nation to take note of this practice. It is time for Congress to take note of it, and time for the people to take note of it.

It is important that adequate protection be afforded from those—whether they be zealots, fanatics, or merely well-meaning judges—determined to force radical doctrines upon an unwilling, but helpless, citizenry.

One of the evils of such a system is that it destroys respect for both the courts and the law.

The decisions of such a court have no permanent value as precedents.

This movement to abolish segregation, which is currently being advocated by the zealots, the fanatics, the crackpots, the Communists, and the fellow travelers, is a part of the Communist Party line, and a part of the Communist Party program.

It is the duty of sensible, patriotic American citizens, who believe in America, her people, and her institutions to resist them, and to see to it that these fuzzy doctrines do not gain a foothold.

I have resisted every such effort, including efforts of the same fanatics, radicals, and zealots, to establish an FEPC law. I shall continue to resist all such efforts. I am glad that the Governor of Georgia has declared himself, and I am glad that the Democratic Party of the State of Georgia has declared itself, and taken a firm stand upon these questions.

A hostile Federal Government tried to cram these doctrines down the throats of the southern people in reconstruc-

tion days. Our people had the stamina then to defeat the zealots, the fanatics, and the crackpots of that day and time in their efforts to achieve the same purpose these present-day crackpots, zealots, and fanatics are undertaking to achieve.

The time has come again when action must be taken—when the people of our section again must say to all usurpers of power, whether it be the Supreme Court, whether it be the President, or whoever it may be—"Thus far you may come, but no farther." That time is here, and I am glad to see the authorities of our State and of our party taking that firm stand. I will support them in it.

I commend the governor of our State for the stand which he has taken in declaring himself upon these matters.

I commend the Democratic Party of the State of Georgia for the resolution which it adopted at the convention in Macon, Ga., on Wednesday, August 9, 1950.

The resolution adopted at the Macon convention is as follows:

Convention Resolution 7

1. On June 5, 1950, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered its opinions in the cases of *Sweatt v. Painter et al.*, and *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education et al.*, whereby that Court ordered Negro students admitted to the University of Texas Law School, established for white students by the State of Texas, and struck down the separation of the races at the University of Oklahoma, notwithstanding the laws of Texas and Oklahoma required that the white and colored races be separately educated.

2. In both of these cases said Court declined to reaffirm the principle long regarded as settled, and, in the year 1896, specifically laid down, by that Court in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, that the several States may recognize that there are differences between the white and colored races, and provide separate and substantially equal public facilities. In the case involving the University of Texas Law School it had been adjudicated by the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court of Texas that the privileges, advantages, and opportunities for the study of law afforded Negro students at Texas State University for Negroes were substantially equivalent to those offered by the State to white students at the University of Texas. In the case involving the University of Oklahoma, the State of Oklahoma, complying with the orders of the United States district court, had admitted the Negro student there involved to the University of Oklahoma, designating for him and the white students separate seating and eating arrangements.

3. It is clear that if these cases be followed there can be no separate educational systems. In the Texas Law School case the Court ruled that for a colored school to be equal to a white school the position and influence of the alumni must be the same, and the schools must have equivalent standing in the community and in traditions and prestige; and, further, that the Texas university for Negroes was not equal to that for white students because white students were excluded from the Negro university. In the Oklahoma case, the Court held that the Negro student was not furnished the same educational opportunities as the white students, although he received the same instruction, from the same professors and the same books, and at the same time and place.

4. Under the doctrine of these decisions the races must be educated together in the public schools beginning with the first grade.

5. These decisions were announced the same day as that of Henderson against

United States, et al., which case involved separation of the races on railroad dining cars. The Attorney General of the United States intervened in the Henderson case, at the direction of the President of the United States, and urged the Court to lay down the rule that there could be no separation of the races by law under any circumstances. This intervention of the President of the United States undoubtedly influenced the Supreme Court of the United States to depart from established principles of law and lay down the new and radical doctrine stated above.

6. The Constitution of the United States does not confer upon the Federal Government any jurisdiction whatever over the educational systems of the individual States. All power, jurisdiction, and authority over their educational systems are reserved to the several States by the United States Constitution in the tenth article of amendment thereto, whereby all powers except those expressly delegated to the United States are reserved to the individual States or to the people. The Supreme Court of the United States is a part of the judicial branch of the Federal Government, and the Constitution of the United States does not confer upon the Federal courts any power over matters reserved to the States.

7. Article VIII, section I, paragraph I of the Constitution of the State of Georgia expressly provides: "Separate schools shall be provided for the white and colored races."

8. Every State has the natural right to defend those parts of its social system which are essential to the happiness, peace, progress, and welfare of its citizens, and essential to the maintenance of its civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Democratic Party of the State of Georgia in convention duly assembled in the City of Macon on this August 9, 1950, as follows:

First. We condemn the action of President Truman in directing the Attorney General of the United States to assume before the Supreme Court of the United States the position that all separation of the races by law should be forbidden. Particularly do we condemn such agitation of these destructive doctrines at a time when the perilous position of our country was known or should have been known by those whose first duty it is to defend this Nation from its enemies. The Federal Government should devote less time and energy in its attempt to destroy the South, and more effort toward defending our common country from its foreign foe.

Second. The decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States above referred to are an unlawful and unwarranted abuse of power and authority. They cannot be justified as lawful on the ground that the Court has jurisdiction to construe and interpret the United States Constitution. That Constitution does not deal with State educational systems and contains nothing on the subject requiring construction or interpretation.

Third. Georgia was not a party to these decisions and in our opinion they are not binding on us.

Fourth. We applaud the position of Gov. Herman E. Talmadge with reference to said decisions, as stated by him in the recent campaign before the people, in that he pledges that at all hazards the separate school system of this State will be maintained as long as he is governor. We in turn pledge him our support in this regard and stand ready to do whatever is necessary to this end.

Fifth. It shall be the duty of the nominees of this convention, said decisions to the contrary notwithstanding, to uphold, maintain, and defend the provisions of the Constitution of this State that there shall be separate schools for the white and colored races. Upon election to their respective offices, it shall be their duty to maintain this law with all the resources of the State and every power at their disposal, which duty each

nominee, by acceptance of his nomination, pledges himself to perform.

Sixth. We call upon the Georgia Senators and Representatives in Congress to introduce in that body appropriate legislation amending the judiciary laws of the United States so that said laws shall expressly provide that no court of the United States shall ever have jurisdiction to entertain any suit directed against the maintenance of separate schools for the white and colored races in those States which provide for such dual system.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a table.)

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when this session of the Eighty-first Congress adjourns I will have completed nearly 18 years of service for the people of my district in Pennsylvania who have honored me as their selection to represent them in this honorable body.

Today out of the entire membership of this body, there are only 30 remaining who served in the Seventy-first Congress. A lot of water has run over the dam since 1930. We have had good times and bad, both during peace and war. Our population has grown from approximately 122,000,000 to an estimated 152,000,000 today, an increase of nearly 25 percent in 2 decades. With the growth of our population there has come about great changes in our social and economic life. Millions of new voters have taken their places in our political life, and it is indeed a tribute to our form of representative government to know that 30 of my colleagues back in 1930 are still here today representing their districts.

In the years that I have served with you, I have learned to admire and respect the Americanism which has so often been exhibited in your actions in this body. During the trying day of the late World War no group of men and women ever worked harder and more faithfully to preserve the ideal of freedom and liberty upon which this Nation was founded. Although we sometimes differed on policies there never was any radical differences on principles. We voted billions upon billions of dollars to save our country in time of war. Today, in the most kindly spirit, I warn you, my colleagues, that the sacrifices we made, and the regulation and regimentation to which we willingly submitted during the war, can destroy this Nation if longer continued in time of peace.

With a public debt of over \$256,000,000,000 we have got to put our financial house in order, or inflation and finally deflation will destroy America from within, more easily and more quickly than it can possibly be destroyed by an enemy attacking from without. Now for a quick look backward. 1929 is a year many of us who are here today still remember. This was the year in which President Hoover, on July 24, proclaimed the Kellogg-Briand Antiwar Treaty in effect. At that time 62 nations pledged

themselves to renounce war as an instrument of national policy. The world was full of hope and prayers were said almost in every nation for the success of the treaty.

I recall now that on December 3, 1929, President Hoover sent a message to Congress in which he recommended that the normal income tax rates applicable to individuals for the calendar year 1929 be reduced from 5, 3, and 1½ percent, to 4, 2, and ½ percent, and that the tax on corporations be reduced from 12 to 11 percent.

I recall also, that 1929 was the year in which the stock market crashed downward with estimated losses of \$50,000,000,000 falling on the shoulders of 25,000,000 persons. At that time, and ever since, this speculative loss was hailed as a dreadful calamity. Yet not 1 acre of our land had been destroyed and our productive capacity was intact. This old bogey, the stock market crash of 1929, has been used as ammunition ever since by politicians for the New Deal and the Fair Deal, and all the rest of the deals, some secret, which have brought our Nation to the verge of bankruptcy today, in spite of the fact that our banks are overflowing, and our pockets are filled with an irredeemable paper currency whose buying power is now at the lowest ebb of all time.

APPROPRIATIONS OF THE SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS

In three sessions the Seventy-first Congress appropriated a total of \$10,240,236,661. During the first session of the Seventy-second Congress the appropriation was \$5,785,252,641.

The Democrats took over the House during the first session and elected John N. Garner, Speaker. In those days, the Democrats were as careful with the public moneys as the Republicans, and in the second session they appropriated only \$7,692,447,339.

From here on things began to happen mighty fast. The money of the people was appropriated and spent for all kinds of new schemes cooked up by the small group of brain trusters the President gathered around him, and whom Dr. Wirt of Gary, Ind., testified were out to lead the President by slow degrees into a new economic order in which all control would be by the Government.

From 1933 to 1939 our tax money was squandered and wasted on all kinds of socialistic schemes to lift us out of the depression. We tried to buy prosperity by all kinds of work relief jobs, and in every year we built up the public debt and increased the cost of Government. The leaf raking, and similar projects paid off only in the loss of morale and self-respect by some and the dependence upon Government largess by the many.

During the 20 years that I have served in this body, I frequently have inquired: "Where are you going to get the money?"

No one seems to have had an answer, so I will now answer my own question. Unless we quit appropriating money, which we do not have in the Treasury, for all kinds of schemes all over the world, we are going to drain the resources of our country, bleed our own people down to their last dollar, and bring about a

change in our form of Government, that none of you who are here today will like.

We are bankrupting the greatest Nation ever to have existed in all the days of mankind. We are destroying liberty under the greatest document ever conceived by the mind of man—our own American Constitution.

We started on the down-hill road to inevitable disaster back in 1909, when some weak-minded politicians, not satisfied with the Government and the Constitution as it then was, decided we ought to imitate some of the European nations and have an income tax. The only reason for an income tax at that time, so far as I can find out, was because we were prosperous in those days. Our national debt was only \$1,148,315,000, an average of \$12.69 per capita. A dollar in those days was worth a dollar. It was backed by gold and could be exchanged for gold at its face value. I find that our dollar was so good that less than a billion dollars of the public debt bore interest, for the simple fact that we then had old non-interest-bearing notes outstanding in the amount of \$276,000,000 that no one seemed desirous of cashing.

How different are things today. The interest on the public debt now amounts to more each year than we were spending back in 1929 for the whole cost of the Federal Government.

Again I repeat, we started on the down hill road, when 42 of the States ratified the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution and it went into effect on February 25, 1913.

In a few short words, the Congress of the United States was given the power to tax, which, as has been so well and frequently said, is also the power to destroy.

Under the fifteenth amendment, there is no limit on the taxing powers of Congress except their own conscience.

Using the taxing power, it is entirely possible to tax a business out of existence, the workers out of jobs, and people out of their property and homes. We have made this Nation almost 100 percent tax slaves, an accomplishment which none should be too proud about.

Next in order will be the making of a Nation of political slaves out of the people, unless the Congress acts to curb the spending by refusing to make appropriations out of any money in the Treasury when we all know the Treasury is empty.

Mr. Speaker, in every year since 1931, the Congress has appropriated more money than the bureaucrats have been able to spend or give away, except in the fiscal years 1945 and 1947.

In this short time we have appropriated and spent over \$715,000,000,000 which amount is greater than the total value of all the physical assets of the North American Continent, including Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the island of the Caribbean.

During this same period the Treasury has collected more than \$476,000,000,000 in revenue of various kinds, and the public debt has risen from approximately \$17,000,000,000 in 1929 to more than \$256,000,000,000 today.

Even during the fiscal year 1950, for which the appropriations totaled \$46,497,456,897, it now appears that nowhere

near this amount can possibly be spent by June 30, so the administration is going to claim the benefits of a big saving, when as a matter of fact the expenditures are running over half a billion more than they were in fiscal 1949, and the receipts are running a billion dollars below the 1949 level as of May 25, 1950.

We have built up the public debt \$3,500,000,000 in the past 11 months and this borrowing and spending by the Gov-

ernment is one of the contributing factors to the inflation which makes every man's dollar worth less in the market place.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I insert a table showing the appropriations, the net receipts of the Treasury, the expenditures from the Treasury and the surplus or deficits by years from 1934 to the estimates for fiscal 1950.

TABLE 1.—Appropriations by fiscal years, net receipts of the Treasury, expenditures reported, and surplus or deficit (—) reported for each year. Source: Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1949, and S. Doc. No. 125, 81st Cong., 1st sess.

| Fiscal year | Appropriations | Receipts, net | Expenditures reported | Surplus or deficit (—) |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1934..... | \$7,692,447,339 | \$3,064,267,912 | \$6,093,899,854 | —\$3,629,631,943 |
| 1935..... | 7,527,559,327 | 3,729,913,845 | 6,520,965,845 | —2,791,052,100 |
| 1936..... | 9,579,757,330 | 4,068,936,689 | 8,493,485,919 | —4,424,549,230 |
| 1937..... | 10,336,399,272 | 4,978,606,695 | 7,756,021,409 | —2,777,420,714 |
| 1938..... | 9,183,701,740 | 5,802,185,636 | 6,978,802,234 | —1,176,616,598 |
| 1939..... | 10,338,996,189 | 5,103,396,943 | 8,965,554,983 | —3,862,158,040 |
| 1940..... | 11,447,634,076 | 5,264,663,044 | 9,182,682,204 | —3,918,019,161 |
| 1941..... | 16,878,805,241 | 7,227,281,333 | 13,386,553,742 | —6,159,272,358 |
| 1942..... | 57,792,715,367 | 12,696,286,084 | 34,186,528,816 | —21,490,242,732 |
| 1943..... | 147,071,208,961 | 22,201,501,787 | 79,621,932,152 | —57,420,430,365 |
| 1944..... | 114,564,008,594 | 43,891,672,699 | 95,315,065,241 | —51,423,392,541 |
| 1945..... | 67,614,266,774 | 44,761,609,047 | 98,702,525,172 | —53,940,916,126 |
| 1946..... | 69,780,137,109 | 40,026,888,964 | 60,703,059,573 | —20,676,170,609 |
| 1947..... | 35,734,209,164 | 40,042,606,290 | 39,288,818,630 | 8,419,469,844 |
| 1948..... | 35,982,887,708 | 42,210,770,493 | 33,791,300,649 | —1,811,440,048 |
| 1949..... | 41,675,480,957 | 38,245,667,810 | 40,057,107,858 | —2,972,134,520 |
| 1950..... | 46,497,456,897 | 31,431,944,838 | 34,404,079,358 | |

¹ Receipts, expenditures, and deficit for fiscal 1950 to May 15, 1950.

The appropriations listed from 1936 to 1950 do not include payments from trust fund receipts, which for fiscal 1950 alone were reported to amount to \$6,517,603,514.

REVENUE ACT OF 1950—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOUGHTON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8920) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a magazine article.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier this afternoon and include a copy of an amendment that he proposed to offer.

Mr. HOBBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter which will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$191.34.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in one include the address delivered by the former Representative from New York, Hon. John J. O'Connor, and in the second include the Optimist's Creed.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news article.

Mr. KING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include editorials appearing in California newspapers.

Mr. KEAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject of planning for civilian defense.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper item.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the use of the congressional frank.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. DAVIES of New York (at the request of Mr. McGUIRE) was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report and other extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$266.50, and further to extend his remarks in three instances and include articles and letters.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6480. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 7940. An act to provide financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9399. An act to provide a more effective method of delivering applications for absentee ballots to servicemen and certain other persons; and

H. R. 9455. An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, as amended, so as to facilitate voting by members of the Armed Forces, and certain others, absent from their places of residence.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1192. An act for the relief of Basque aliens;

S. 1208. An act for the relief of Pasch Bros.;

S. 1357. An act for the relief of Gregory Pirro and Nellie Pirro;

S. 1501. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ray S. Berrum;

S. 1507. An act to amend section 10 of the Act of August 2, 1946, relating to the receipt of pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses while drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay, and for other purposes.

S. 2028. An act to permit the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in the foreign exchange program in cooperation with the United States Office of Education;

S. 2324. An act for the relief of Maria Balsam;

S. 2599. An act for the relief of Arturo Bennetti;

S. 2648. An act for the relief of Carlo Fava;

S. 2835. An act for the relief of Boris Paul von Stuckenberg and wife, Maria Alexander von Stuckenberg;

S. 2922. An act for the relief of Chieko Murata;

S. 3015. An act for the relief of Walter Tyson;

S. 3018. An act for the relief of W. F. Steiner;

S. 3121. An act for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Planetto;

S. 3306. An act for the relief of Dr. George Peter Petropoulos;

S. 3307. An act for the relief of Colvin Bernard Melk;

S. 3321. An act for the relief of Dr. Zena (Zenobia) Symeonides;

S. 3431. An act for the relief of Tatiana Moravec;

S. 3434. An act for the relief of Mikiko Anzai;

S. 3579. An act for the relief of Midshipman Willis Howard Dukelow, United States Navy;

S. 3796. An act to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the use of petroleum as fuel aboard steam vessels;

S. 3807. An act to authorize the President to appoint Col. Henry A. Byroade as Director of the Bureau of German Affairs, Department of State, without affecting his military status and perquisites;

S. 3814. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfoot Indian Reservation;

S. 3824. An act for the relief of Kenneth Bruce Kohel Kozal; and

S. 3917. An act for the relief of Basilio Gorgone.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House of Representatives adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 22, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1679. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the first report of the Department of the Army relative to the disposal of Army excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, covering the period between July 1, 1949,

and December 31, 1949, pursuant to section 404 (d), title IV, of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the National Lawyers Guild, pursuant to House Resolution 5, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, without amendment (Rept. No. 3123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on conference. H. R. 8920. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3124). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee of conference. H. R. 7824. A bill to provide for the administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3125). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 284. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the symposium entitled "Executive Reorganization" as a House document, and providing for additional copies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 3127). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 832. Resolution providing for the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 474. With an amendment (Rept. No. 3128). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 828. Resolution authorizing the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities; with an amendment (Rept. No. 3129). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Eighty-first Congress, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 3130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9715. A bill to amend section 1205 of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 3131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee of conference. H. R. 5372. A bill to authorize the negotiation, approval and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota and of Standing Rock Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and for other related purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3132). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee of conference. H. R. 1056. A bill for the relief of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 3122). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 859. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Green; without amendment (Rept. No. 3126). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 9723. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant colleges and universities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 9724. A bill to create a Susquehanna Watershed Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 9725. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9726. A bill to assist the national defense by authorizing the provision of housing at reactivated military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 9727. A bill to authorize the training of an adequate backlog of airmen to meet the civil and military needs of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. R. 9728. A bill to make a preliminary survey of certain tributaries of Turtle Creek, Pa., to prevent reoccurring flood damage; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9729. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide more adequate Federal grants to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for public assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. J. Res. 544. Joint resolution providing for the transfer of funds from the old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund to the railroad retirement account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. Res. 861. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of alleged practices in the "sale" of children by institutions charged with their care; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 9730. A bill for the relief of Martin M. Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 9731. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 9732. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of Charlie Joe Starnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2379. By the SPEAKER: Petition of E. D. McKinnon, secretary, St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly, St. Paul, Minn., relative to enactment of an excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1950

The Senate met at 11:30 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose approval we seek above the hollow applause of men, we pause in the midst of thronging duties and confused issues that Thou might lift upon us the light of Thy countenance. Inspire and guide with the spirit of understanding these Thy servants, the few among the many, in a great and crucial day lifted by their fellows to high pedestals of power and influence. May their words and counsels so laden with possibilities to affect this stricken generation add to the world's store of good will and be for the healing of the nations. May the tyranny of expediency never bend our conscience to low aims which betray high principles.

Hear, Thou, our prayer as out of the depths we cry, bowing at the world's great altar stairs which slope through darkness up to Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McKellar, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 21, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 21, 1950, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1640. An act to amend section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. 962; 16 U. S. C. 513), relating to membership of the National Forest Reservation Commission;

S. 2822. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U. S. C. title 12, sec. 264);

S. 3768. An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; and

S. 4118. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the Air Engineering Development Center.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9219. An act to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9322. An act to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment and maintenance of aids to navigation on private structures in or over navigable waters of the United States;

H. R. 9538. An act to amend subsection (1) of section 4551 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to exempt additional vessels from the requirements thereof; and

H. R. 9681. An act to authorize the waiver of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 284. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the symposium entitled "Executive Reorganization" as a House document, and providing for additional copies thereof; and

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to return H. R. 1025.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2801. An act to give effect to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, and for other purposes; and

S. 3437. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. Wherry, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Morse was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

On his own request and by unanimous consent Mr. Robertson was excused from attendance on the Senate tomorrow if there should be a session.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CATALOG
PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Director of the Staff of the Munitions Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 97, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a joint report on the Federal Catalog Program by the Munitions Board and General Services Administration, dated August 1950, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

RESOLUTION OF THE FIFTEENTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS OF THE UNITED STATES, FIRST SESSION 1950, PETITIONING THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE FAVORABLE ACTION ON THE REQUEST OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL GUARD UNITS IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

"Whereas on several occasions the government of the Virgin Islands has requested the Federal Government to provide for the establishment in the Virgin Islands of units of the National Guard; and

"Whereas as a result of these requests, bills have been introduced into the Houses of Congress for the purpose; and

"Whereas it is believed that, with the world condition being unsettled as it is, the existence and efficient functioning of units of the National Guard in the Virgin Islands could do much in collaboration with the present home guard units to assist in providing proper and adequate military and civilian defense for this military outpost of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of the Virgin Islands fully support the requests and urgent appeals of the government of the Virgin Islands to the Federal Government for the establishment of units of the National Guard of the Virgin Islands, and through their elected representatives in the legislative assembly, desire to so express themselves: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved and it is hereby resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands in session assembled, That the President and Congress of the United States are hereby petitioned to favorably respond to the urgent appeals and grant the request of the Government of the Virgin Islands to establish in the Virgin Islands units of the National Guard; and be it further

"Resolved and it is hereby further resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands."

Thus passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands of the United States on September 11, 1950.

Witness our hands and the seal of the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands this 11th day of September A. D., 1950.

OMAR BROWN,
Chairman.
EARLE B. OTTLEY,
Secretary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9524) to supplement the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2579) thereon.

RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO FILE REPORTS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Relations with International Organizations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has a number of reports under preparation which may be ready for issuance within the next few months.

They deal with the very important field of expenditures and efficient management of the United Nations and other major international organizations in which the United States Government plays such a vital role.

For the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I request unanimous consent to file reports during the adjourned period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 22, 1950, he